

The Complementation of the Verb *Insist* in Recent Centuries

Sini Kaukonen
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literary Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
April 2014

Tässä korpuspohjaisessa pro gradu -tutkielmassa tutkitaan verbin *insist* komplementaatiota brittienglannissa 1700-luvun alusta nykypäivään. Tarkoituksena on selvittää, mitä eri komplementteja verbi *insist* valitsee ja miten tilanne on muuttunut viime vuosisatojen aikana. Lisäksi tutkimuksen kohteena ovat *insist*-verbin eri merkitykset sekä niiden mahdolliset yhteydet eri komplementtityyppeihin.

Tutkimuksessa hyödynnettävä aineisto on kerätty kahdesta elektronisesta korpuksista, jotka ovat *Corpus of Late Modern English Texts* -korpuksen laajennettu versio (CLMETEV) sekä *British National Corpus* (BNC). Tutkielman historiallisen aineiston tarjoaa CLMETEV, jonka kolmesta 70 vuoden ajanjaksoon jaetusta osasta käytän tässä tutkielmassa ensimmäistä (1710-1780) ja kolmatta (1850-1920). Nykypäivän brittienglantia edustaa sen sijaan BNC-korpuksista saatu aineisto. Vertailukelpoisuuden säilyttämiseksi BNC:stä valittiin Imaginative Prose -tekstilaji, sillä se vastaa parhaiten CLMETEV:n sisältöä.

Tutkimuksen teoreettisessa alkuosassa esitellään ensin korpuksien ja korpuslingvistiikka. Tämän jälkeen siirrytään tarkastelemaan komplementaatioon liittyviä asioita, kuten valenssiteoriaa ja komplementin ja adjunktin välistä eroa. Lisäksi tarkastelun kohteena ovat erilaiset komplementaatioon vaikuttavat tekijät, kuten *horror aequi* -periaate, jonka mukaan samanmuotoiset elementit välttävät toistensa välittömässä läheisyydessä esiintymistä sekä Rohdenburgin Great Complement Shift -teoria, joka kuvaa viime vuosisatojen aikana englannin kielen lausekomplementaatioissa tapahtuneita muutoksia.

Teoreettisena viitepohjana tutkielmassa on käytetty kolmea eri sanakirjaa, jotka ovat *The Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), *The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* sekä *The Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Näiden lisäksi tutkielmassa on hyödynnetty myös useita eri kielioppiteoksia, joiden avulla on tutkittu alustavasti *insist*-verbin komplementaatiota.

Tutkielman toisessa osassa analysoidaan korpusaineisto kronologisessa järjestyksessä, alkaen vanhimmasta materiaalista. Tuloksista käy ilmi, että verbin *insist* komplementaatioissa on tapahtunut merkittäviä muutoksia viime vuosisatojen aikana. Yksi merkittävimmistä muutoksista on *on*-preposition suosion jatkuva kasvaminen *upon*-preposition kustannuksella. Nykyään *on*-prepositio onkin selvästi *upon*-prepositiota suositumpi vaihtoehto *insist*-verbin komplementaatioissa kaikissa komplementtityypeissä. Toinen merkittävä muutos on *that*-lauseiden ja zero-komplementtien (eli komplementin poisjättämisen) huomattava kasvu sekä *on* / *upon* + NP -komplementtien ja *on* / *upon* + *poss ing* -komplementtien väheneminen *insist*-verbin komplementaatioissa. Verbin *insist* semanttinen analyysi puolestaan paljasti, että verbin neljästä alkuperäisestä merkityksestä yleisessä käytössä on oikeastaan enää kaksi. Lisäksi aineistosta kävi ilmi myös tietyt yhteydet yhä käytössä olevien merkitysten ja eri komplementtityyppien välillä.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. On corpora and corpus linguistics	3
2.1 Corpora	3
2.2 Corpus linguistics	5
2.3 Limitations of corpus linguistics	7
2.4 The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts	8
2.5 The British National Corpus	10
2.6 Normalized frequencies	11
3. Complementation	12
3.1 Valency theory	12
3.2 Complements vs. adjuncts	13
4. <i>Insist</i> in the previous literature	17
4.1 The <i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>	17
4.1.1 Complementation	17
4.1.2 Senses	17
4.2 The <i>Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary</i>	19
4.3 The <i>Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary</i>	19
4.4 Grammars	20
5. Factors bearing on complementation	22
5.1 The Complexity Principle	22
5.2 Extractions	22
5.3 The Great Complement Shift	23
5.4 The <i>horror aequi</i> principle	23
6. The CLMETEV: Part One (1710-1780)	25
6.1 The complementation patterns found in the data	25
6.1.1 Non-sentential complements	26
6.1.2 Sentential complements	27
6.2 Sense and structure	33
6.3 Extractions	35
7. The CLMETEV: Part Three (1850-1920)	38
7.1 The complementation patterns found in the data	38
7.1.1 Non-sentential complements	39
7.1.2 Sentential complements	41
7.2 Sense and structure	46
7.3 Extractions	48

8. The BNC	51
8.1 The complementation patterns found in the data	51
8.1.1 Non-sentential complements	52
8.1.2 Sentential complements	55
8.2 Sense and structure	58
8.3 Extractions	60
9. Conclusion	63
References	68

1. Introduction

Consider the following sentences from the *Oxford English Dictionary*:

- (1) Socrates is not prepared to *insist on the literal accuracy of this description*. (Jowett 1875)
- (2) I cannot now *insist Upon particulars*. (B. Jonson 1609)
- (3) The king *insisted that a sacred profession should not be used as a screen for the protection of felony*. (Froude 1883)
- (4) 'Do you care for me at all?' he *insisted*. (W. S. Maugham 1906)

As can be seen from these examples, there are several different kinds of complementation patterns that can follow the verb *insist*. The purpose of this thesis is to examine the complementation patterns and senses of the verb *insist* from the early 18th century to the late 20th century, with the help of authentic data from two corpora. The extended version of the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, also known as the CLMETEV, will provide the historical data for this thesis. The CLMETEV is subdivided into three sub-sections, each including texts from a period of 70 years. The first part covers the period 1710-1780, the second 1780-1850 and the third 1850-1920. As the amount of tokens that include the verb *insist* are quite numerous in the CLMETEV, I will only use the first and third parts of the corpus in this study. The present-day language data, on the other hand, will be taken from the Imaginative Prose section of the British National Corpus (the BNC).

This thesis is divided into two parts, the first of which deals with the theoretical background information relevant to this study. The first part begins with an introduction to corpora and corpus linguistics, normalized frequencies, and the two corpora used in this thesis, the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts and the British National Corpus. I will then discuss the notion of complementation by introducing valency theory and by explaining the difference between a complement and an adjunct. After that I will see what is said about the verb *insist* in the previous literature by first introducing the different senses and complementation patterns of *insist* with the help of the online version of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and two other dictionaries, the *Oxford*

Advanced Learner's Dictionary and the *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. I will also see what different grammars say about *insist* and its complementation. Finally, I will discuss certain factors that might have an effect on the complementation of *insist*, including the Great Complement Shift and the *horror aequi* principle.

The second part of this thesis consists of the presentation of my findings in the data from the first and third parts of the CLMETEV and from the Imaginative Prose section of the BNC. I will first examine and count the different complements of *insist* in the data. After that, I will analyze the different senses of *insist* that can be found in the data, and see whether a certain complement is used with a certain sense of *insist*. I will also compare the ideas and principles found in the previous literature to the actual data found in the CLMETEV and the BNC. Because this is a diachronic study, I am particularly interested to see if any diachronic change can be identified in the complementation of *insist*.

The main reason for conducting this study is to examine the verb *insist*, and to hopefully provide some new and valuable insight into its complementation. As errors in complementation are common among English language learners, this thesis can also benefit language teaching and learning by shedding some light into the rather complicated issue of complementation, at least when it comes to the verb *insist*. In addition, it has been noted that the Late Modern English period has been largely neglected in linguistic research despite the fact that the period is a well-documented one (De Smet 2005, 69). For its part, this study can also contribute to the study of Late Modern English, as most of the data investigated in this thesis comes from that particular period.

2. On corpora and corpus linguistics

In this chapter I will provide an overview of corpora and corpus linguistics. I will also introduce the two corpora used in this thesis, the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts and the British National Corpus. In addition, normalized frequencies will be introduced in this chapter.

2.1 Corpora

The *Oxford English Dictionary* lists several different senses for the word *corpus*, all of which denote a body of some kind. For the purposes of this thesis, the sense that is most relevant is “the body of written or spoken material upon which a linguistic analysis is based” (s.v. *corpus* 3b). Kennedy's definition of a corpus as “a body of written text or transcribed speech which can serve as a basis for linguistic analysis and description” (1998, 1) is obviously very similar to the one in the *OED*, but he also points out that different corpora have been compiled for many different purposes, which affects the design, size and nature of any individual corpus (1998, 3). McEnery and Wilson, on the other hand, take a much broader view when they say that “in principle, any collection of more than one text can be called a corpus: the term 'corpus' is simply the Latin for 'body', hence a corpus may be defined as any body of text” (2001, 29). However, they also recognize the fact that when the term *corpus* is used in the context of modern linguistics, it tends to have more specific connotations. These can be considered under the following headings: sampling and representativeness, finite size, machine-readable form and a standard reference (2001, 29).

When building a corpus of a particular language variety, it is important to collect a sample that is as representative as possible of the variety under examination. This can be done by collecting samples from a broad range of different authors and genres which, “when taken together, may be considered to 'average out' and provide a reasonably accurate picture of the entire language population in which we are interested” (McEnery and Wilson 2001, 30). Biber et al. also discuss the

representativeness of corpora when they point out that instead of being just a collection of texts, “a corpus seeks to represent a language or some part of a language” (1998, 246). An important factor for any corpus that aims at representing a language is the diversity of the texts that it includes, including register and dialect variation as well as the variation of subject matter (Biber et al. 1998, 248). The representativeness of the corpus, then, determines what kind of research questions can be addressed and whether the results of the research can be generalized (1998, 246).

As McEnery and Wilson point out, “the term 'corpus' also tends to imply a body of text of a finite size” (2001, 30). Even though there are such things as open-ended monitor corpora that texts are constantly being added to, a corpus usually has a finite number of words in it (2001, 30-31). This means that a corpus is not increased in size after it has reached its grand total of words (2001, 31). For this reason, a corpus is usually “a static collection of texts selected in some principled way, intended to be typical of the whole language or an aspect of the language at a particular time” (Kennedy 1998, 60). Biber et al. also discuss how important issues of size are when compiling a corpus. They involve not only the number of words in a corpus, but also “the number of texts from different categories, the number of samples from each text, and the number of words in each sample” (Biber et al. 1998, 248-249). Issues of size are important because not only the quality but also the quantity of text in a corpus has a significant impact on how representative and balanced the corpus is, and the representativeness of a corpus in turn affects the validity and reliability of the corpus (Kennedy 1998, 66). In addition to size, in diachronic corpora, time is also an important factor that must be represented adequately (Biber et al. 1998, 251).

Even though the term *corpus* could only be used to refer to printed text for a long time, nowadays the term almost always refers to a machine-readable corpus (McEnery and Wilson 2001, 31). According to McEnery and Wilson, machine-readable corpora possess several advantages over the original written or spoken format (2001, 31). First, it is possible to search and manipulate machine-readable corpora in ways that are not possible with other formats (2001, 31). In addition,

new information can be added to machine-readable corpora particularly quickly and easily (2001, 32).

McEnery and Wilson also note that there is often “a tacit understanding that a corpus constitutes a standard reference for the language variety which it represents” (2001, 32). This presupposes that a corpus is widely available to other researchers, which is indeed the case with many corpora. The advantage of such a widely available corpus, then, is that it can provide a benchmark by which subsequent studies may be evaluated. So, as a conclusion, it can be said that instead of being simply a collection of texts, a corpus in modern linguistics might be more accurately described as “a finite-sized body of machine-readable text, sampled in order to be maximally representative of the language variety under consideration” (2001, 32).

2.2. Corpus linguistics

Corpus linguistics is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as “the branch of linguistics concerned with analysis of corpora as a means of studying language” (s.v. *corpus*). McEnery and Wilson, on the other hand, define corpus linguistics as “the study of language based on examples of 'real life' language use” (2001, 1). Yet another definition for corpus linguistics is provided by Kennedy, who says that corpus linguistics is based on bodies of texts as the domain of study and the source of linguistic evidence (1998, 7). Even though the approach was unpopular in the 1960s and 1970s, corpus linguistics has now come to be an increasingly popular methodology in linguistic research (McEnery and Wilson 2001, 1). It is also maturing methodologically and the range of languages addressed by corpus linguistics is growing annually (2001, 25).

As Kennedy points out, corpus linguistics is not only concerned with what words, structures or uses are possible in a language but also with what is likely to happen in language use (Kennedy 1998, 8). According to Kennedy, corpus linguistics is “concerned primarily with the description and

explanation of the nature, structure and use of language and languages and with particular matters such as language acquisition, variation and change” (1998, 8). Studying language change is also the purpose of this thesis, which focuses on identifying any changes in the complementation of *insist* over the past few centuries. Kennedy points out that even though corpus linguistics did not begin with the development of computers, computers have clearly given corpus linguistics a massive boost by “reducing much of the drudgery of text-based linguistic description and vastly increasing the size of the databases used for analysis” (Kennedy 1998, 2). In addition, computers have introduced “incredible speed, total accountability, accurate replicability, statistical reliability and the ability to handle huge amounts of data” (1998, 5). Such technological advances have completely revolutionized corpus linguistics.

McEnery and Wilson say that corpus linguistics is not a branch of linguistics in the same sense as semantics or syntax, for example, which focus on describing some aspect of language use. Instead, it is a methodology that can be taken to many aspects of linguistic enquiry (2001, 2). In other words, it can be said that corpus linguistics is “a methodology that may be used in almost any area of linguistics, but does not truly delimit an area of linguistics itself” (2001, 2). However, corpus linguistics does allow us to differentiate between methodological approaches taken to the same area of enquiry by different groups, individuals or studies, therefore separating corpus-based syntax from non-corpus-based syntax, for example. For this reason, McEnery and Wilson believe that in that respect, corpus linguistics “does define an area of linguistics or, at least, a series of areas of linguistics” (2001, 2). This point of view is also supported by Kennedy, who says that corpus linguistics has “developed something of a life of its own within linguistics, with a tendency sometimes to focus on lexis and lexical grammar rather than pure syntax” (1998, 8).

2.3 Limitations of corpus linguistics

Even though corpus linguistics has become a popular and helpful methodology in linguistic research, it still involves some issues that need to be taken into consideration. According to Leech, Chomsky rejected the use of corpus data as a source of evidence in linguistic enquiry (1968, 89). Chomsky argued that human languages include nuisance variables, such as false starts and hesitations, which, together with the limitations of human memory, have an effect on the rules of grammar and their realisation in linguistic performance. Consequently, Chomsky felt that corpus material is inadequate as a source for linguistic data because of its remoteness from linguistic competence (1968, 89). Instead, in Chomsky's generative linguistics, the dominant way of collecting data has traditionally been introspection (Lindquist 2009, 8).

Gries also discusses the problems involved in corpus linguistics. He points out that because of the inherent complexity of language, corpora are:

- never infinite although language is in principle an infinite system;
- never really representative in the sense that they really contain all parts or registers or genres or varieties of human language;
- never really balanced in the sense that they contain these parts or registers or genres or varieties in exactly the proportions such parts make up in the language as a whole;
- never complete in the sense that they never contain all the contextual information that humans utilize in, say, conversation (2010g, 121-122).

In other words, no matter how large a corpus is, it can never fully represent a language in its entirety. When compiling a corpus, the compilers can, however, take important steps to make sure that the corpus is as representative as possible, so that appropriate generalizations can be made about the language in question based on the corpus data.

In addition, locating the desired items in a corpus with high accuracy can also prove to be problematic. Precision and recall are two important factors that may cause potential inaccuracy in corpus linguistics. Ball defines *precision* as “the proportion of retrieved material that is relevant”, and *recall* as “the proportion of relevant information that was retrieved” (1994, 295). This means

that a search may either bring up both relevant and irrelevant tokens, or it may not bring up all the relevant tokens in the corpus. As Lüdeling et al. point out, it is in principle possible to deal with low precision by checking the results manually, as long as the search results are fully available and the work does not take too much time (2007, 12). However, low recall poses a more serious problem in corpus linguistics. According to Ball, assessing recall in a large corpus is particularly difficult because it is not possible to know whether any relevant tokens have been missed in a search without analyzing the entire corpus manually, which would take a lot of time (1994, 295). For this reason, low recall is a problem that is often very difficult or even impossible to correct, and it may create unpredictable errors in the frequency counts (Lüdeling et al. 2007, 12).

2.4 The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts

The texts of the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET) were compiled using two main Internet sources, the *Project Gutenberg* and *The Oxford Text Archive* (De Smet 2005, 70). In addition, the extended version of the corpus, the CLMETEV, also includes texts from the *Victorian Women Writers Project*. According to Hendrik De Smet, "the corpus is not exactly a fixed body of texts in the same way as conventional corpora of English are" because anyone can add or exclude texts from it if they wish to do so (2005, 70). The corpus covers the period from 1710 to 1920, which has been divided into three parts, each covering a period of 70 years. The first part includes texts from the years 1710-1780, the second part from 1780-1850, and the last one from 1850-1920 (De Smet 2005, 70).

The CLMET was compiled following four principles. First, all texts within one sub-period of the corpus are written by authors born within a time-span of seventy years, starting thirty years before the beginning of each of the three parts of the corpus. This method was chosen "to increase the homogeneity within each sub-period - and accordingly, to decrease the homogeneity between the sub-periods" (De Smet 2005, 70). It should also make the historical trends of each period appear

more clearly. In addition, no author can be represented in two subsequent parts of the corpus. However, De Smet also points out that there is a slight disadvantage to using this method, which is that some authors' work cannot be included in the corpus if the authors belong to one sub-period of the corpus by birth, but all of their work falls within another sub-period by its date of publication (2005, 70).

Second, all authors chosen for the corpus are British, and native speakers of English, which is supposed to restrict dialectal variation. De Smet also wanted to "facilitate comparison of the data from the CLMET to data from other historical corpora and from the large corpora of Present-Day English, which are mostly corpora of British English" (2005, 71).

Third, the amount of text that any one author provided for the corpus was limited to 200,000 words. This was done to avoid distorting the data with the idiosyncrasies of individual authors (De Smet 2005, 71). Fourth, De Smet tried to collect data from different text genres, and from authors with different social backgrounds. According to De Smet, the texts found on the *Project Gutenberg* and the *Oxford English Archive* are typically formal texts, written by higher class male authors (2005, 71). To counteract this bias, De Smet "deliberately favoured non-literary texts over literary ones and texts from lower registers over texts from higher registers", whenever this was possible (2005, 71). In addition, De Smet also wanted to make sure that texts written by women writers were also included in the corpus.

Despite these measures, the CLMET is still biased "both sociolinguistically and in terms of genre and register", being largely made up of formal texts written by highly schooled higher class male adults (De Smet 2005, 78-79). Such texts might not be the best source for authentic data when studying language change because, as De Smet points out, formal texts written by highly educated writers "are exactly the type of texts where one expects language change to be kept at a tight leash" (2005, 79). However, given its size, the CLMET can be very useful when studying less frequent lexico-grammatical phenomena, for which smaller corpora cannot provide enough data (2005, 80).

2.5 The British National Corpus

According to the *Reference Guide for the British National Corpus*, the BNC is a 100 million word collection of samples of contemporary spoken and written British English. Work on building the corpus started in 1991, and the first edition was finished in 1994. In this thesis, I use the third edition, or *BNC XML Edition*, which was released in 2007. The British National Corpus contains 4,049 texts, out of which 90 percent come from written sources and 10 percent from spoken sources. According to Kennedy, the texts from the written sources consist of approximately 75 percent informative prose, from the year 1975 onwards, and 25 percent imaginative prose, from 1960 onwards (1998, 50). In this thesis, I will examine data only from the Imaginative Prose section of the BNC because that makes it easier to compare the data from the BNC with the data from the CLMETEV. The Imaginative Prose section of the BNC consists of 16,496,420 words in 476 texts.

According to Kennedy, the BNC was designed to represent British English as a whole (1998, 50). In other words, the goal was to create a corpus that was well balanced and included a wide range of genres from both written and spoken English and that was also widely accessible for various purposes (Kennedy 1998, 50). The target sample size chosen for the corpus was 40,000 words, and no extract is longer than 45,000 words. In their work, the compilers of the British National Corpus used layered sampling which was intended to “act as a control on the collection of texts so as to ensure that the corpus was representative of a broad range of styles of English” (Kennedy 1998, 52-53). The sampling involved four selection features: domain (subject field), time, medium (books, periodicals, leaflets etc.) and level. In order to make the corpus representative of the different so-called 'levels' of British English, about 30 percent of the written material came from more literary or 'high' style, about 45 percent from 'middle', and about 25 percent from more informal or 'low' style (Kennedy 1998, 51).

Unlike the CLMETEV, the British National Corpus is a tagged corpus, and automatic word-class tagging was carried out when the corpus was created. With such a large corpus, however, there

was no opportunity for checking and correcting the grammatical tagging exhaustively, which resulted in several tagging errors. In fact, as Kennedy also points out, the size of the corpus posed challenges not only for tagging but also for text capture, storage and processing capacity (1998, 53). For this reason, “errors are inevitable in transcriptions (e.g. *there* / *their*), and spelling errors in the original written texts, or from optical scanning (*clear* read as *dear*) cannot all be corrected in a corpus of that size” (1998, 53).

2.6 Normalized frequencies

When analyzing the frequency of certain features found in different segments of the same corpus or in different corpora of varied sizes, it is important to make sure that the counts are comparable. According to Biber et al., “normalization' is a way to adjust raw frequency counts from texts of different lengths so that they can be compared accurately” (1998, 263). When normalizing frequency counts, “the raw frequency count should be divided by the number of words in the text, and then multiplied by whatever basis is chosen for norming” (Biber et. al. 1998, 263). In this thesis, I will use the basis “instances per million words” when I am normalizing frequency counts. So, by way of illustration, if I want to get the normalized frequency (NF) of a certain number of tokens in the first part of the CLMETEV, which contains 3,037,607 words in total, I will first divide the number of tokens by 3,037,607 and then multiply it by one million, as in the following example, where the number of tokens is 25:

$$(25 : 3,037,607) \times 1,000,000 \sim 8.2 \text{ (NF)}$$

3. Complementation

In this chapter, I will discuss the notion of complementation by first introducing valency theory and then explaining the difference between a complement and an adjunct.

3.1 Valency theory

According to Herbst et al., the main assumption of valency theory is that the verb has a central role in a sentence because it determines the number of other elements that have to occur in order to make the sentence grammatical (2004, xxiv). In valency theory, such elements are called *complements*, and the valency of a verb is determined by the number of complements the verb takes. In the following example by Herbst et al. (2004, xxiv), the verb *put* requires both *paper and kindling* and *by the fire* as its complements, otherwise the sentence will become ungrammatical.

- (1) I put paper and kindling by the fire last night.
- a. *I put by the fire.
- b. *I put paper and kindling.

As Herbst et al. point out, the valency of a verb largely determines the structure of a sentence, and for this reason, “the verb is given a central status in the sentence hierarchy and the complements are seen as being dependent upon the governing verb” (2004, xxiv).

In addition to complements, there are also other elements that can occur in sentences. Elements that are not dependent on the valency of the governing verb are called *adjuncts*, which are “essentially optional elements which can be said to complete the meaning of the central predication as a whole” (Somers 1984, 508). In the following example by Somers (1984, 508), the phrase *in London* is an adjunct and can be removed without loss of grammaticality in (2a), whereas in (2b) it is a complement of the verb *live*, and therefore cannot be freely eliminated.

- (2) a. He looked for his friend in London.
 b. James lives in London.

The distinction between complements and adjuncts is important because this thesis focuses only on the complementation of the verb *insist*, and adjuncts will not be included in the analysis. For this reason, the distinction will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

3.2 Complements vs. adjuncts

Huddleston and Pullum list the following major categories of complements: NPs, AdjPs, AdvPs, PPs and subordinate clauses.

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| (3) a. I took <u>the car</u> . | [NP] |
| b. She was <u>disgusted at his betrayal</u> . | [AdjP] |
| c. They treat us <u>quite abominably</u> . | [AdvP] |
| d. He relied <u>on his mother</u> . | [PP] |
| e. I hadn't noticed <u>that she was looking so worried</u> . | [subordinate clause] |

Complements can be divided into two major groups: non-sentential and sentential complements. The first four categories of complements mentioned by Huddleston and Pullum, i.e. NPs, AdjPs, AdvPs and PPs, are usually non-sentential complements, but there are also sentential PP complements, such as *on/upon* + *ing*-clause complements. Subordinate clauses, on the other hand, are sentential complements. According to Biber et al., "complement clauses are a type of dependent clause used to complete the meaning relationship of an associated verb or adjective in a higher clause" (1999, 658). There are four major types of complement clause: *that*-clauses, *wh*-clauses, *to*-infinitive clauses and *ing*-clauses (Biber et al. 1999, 658). *That*-clauses (4a) and *wh*-clauses (4b) are finite clauses, which means that they include tense and modality distinctions and they must also have a subject. On the other hand, *to*-infinitive clauses (4c) and *ing*-clauses (4d) are non-finite and do not include tense distinctions or modals. Non-finite clauses also often omit the subject (Biber et al. 1999, 658-659). (The following examples are from Biber et al. 1999.)

- (4) a. They warned him that it's dangerous.
 b. I couldn't think what it was.
 c. We wanted to talk in front of my aunt.
 d. He began crunching it gently but firmly.

Biber et al. point out that there are also non-finite complement clauses that occur with an infinitive verb form but no complementizer (5). *Ed*-clauses (6) can also function as verb complements (Biber et al. 1999, 659).

- (5) Surrey police say the film would help identify participants at the weekend party.
 (6) I got the door unlocked.

According to Huddleston and Pullum, "the most important property of complements in clause structure is that they require the presence of an appropriate verb that licenses them" (2002, 219), as exemplified by the following sentences (the following examples are from Huddleston & Pullum 2002, unless noted otherwise):

- (7) a. She mentioned the letter.
 b. *She alluded the letter.

This kind of dependence between complements and their head verbs is called subcategorisation, which means that verbs are subcategorised based on the complementation that they take (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 219). Different subcategories of verb, such as intransitive and transitive verbs, occur with different patterns of complementation. This is why (7b) is ungrammatical: the verb *allude* does not belong to the subcategory of verbs that licenses O, whereas the verb *mention* does.

According to Leech and Svartvik, "the term 'complement', in a general sense, means something that is necessary to complete a grammatical construction" (2002, 271). Huddleston and Pullum also point out that another important property of complements is that they are sometimes obligatory, which means that they cannot be left out without loss of grammaticality or a change in

meaning. Adjuncts, on the other hand, are always optional (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 221). In the following examples, the omission of an obligatory complement results in an ungrammatical sentence (8b), whereas leaving out an adjunct does not (9b).

- (8) a. She perused the report.
b. *She perused.
- (9) a. She left because she was ill.
b. She left.

There are also optional complements, which are not as distinct from adjuncts as the obligatory ones (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 221). They are complements as they are licensed by the verb, but they are also optional because leaving them out does not make a sentence ungrammatical. This can be seen in the following sentences, where the part following the verb (adjunct in (10a), and optional complement in (11a)) can be left out in both cases. However, if it is not left out, the verb governs the selection of the preposition in (11a), whereas the preposition in (10a) can be changed:

- (10) a. He set out with/without sufficient food.
b. He set out.
- (11) a. It depends on the cost.
b. It depends.

According to Somers, the most common complement-adjunct distinction tests are the *elimination test* and the *extraction method* (1984, 509). By using the elimination test, in which an element is eliminated from a sentence, it is possible to see which components are obligatory for the sentence to remain grammatical. In the following example, the elements *the book* and *under the table* are complements of the verb *put* because removing them makes the sentence ungrammatical.

- (12) a. *He put the book under the table.*
b. *He put the book.
c. *He put under the table.
d. *He put. (Somers 1984, 509)

In the extraction method, "the aim is to establish which elements are closely associated with the verb, that is, complement vs. adjunct" (Somers 1984, 510). The extraction method differs from the elimination test in that, instead of only focusing on the grammaticality of a sentence, it takes into account the changes in meaning resulting from the extraction of elements. Therefore, it is not possible to extract *his field* from (13a), even though (13b) is still grammatical, because it would change the meaning of the predicate.

- (13) a. The farmer ploughs his field.
 b. The farmer ploughs. (Somers 1984, 510)

Another complement-adjunct distinction test is the *do so* test. According to Somers, "while a *do so* phrase can be the proform of anything up to the entire predication (less its subject), the MINIMUM element that can be substituted is the predicate PLUS ANY COMPLEMENTS (again, other than the subject)" (1984, 517). What follows is that "if a dependent (other than the subject) can combine with *do so* this is sufficient to show that it is an adjunct" (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 223). Thus, *in the garage* is a complement in (14a), whereas in (14b) it is an adjunct.

- (14) a. *Jill keeps her car in the garage but Pam does so in the road.
 b. Jill washes her car in the garage but Pam does so in the road. (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 223)

4. *Insist* in the previous literature

In this chapter, I will first introduce the different senses and complementation patterns of *insist* with the help of three dictionaries, and then I will turn to different grammars and see what they say about *insist* and its complements.

4.1 The *Oxford English Dictionary*

4.1.1 Complementation

As will be shown in Table 1, there is clearly much variation in the complement selection of *insist*. For example, it can have a *that*-clause as a complement, introduced either by *that* or \emptyset . Other complements of *insist* mentioned in the *Oxford English Dictionary* include a zero complement and a prepositional phrase complement beginning with *on* or *upon* and followed by an NP or an *ing*-clause. In addition, NPs, *to*-infinitives and prepositional phrases beginning with *against*, *for*, *in* and *of* used to be complements of *insist*, but they have become obsolete.

4.1.2 Senses

The *OED* lists four different senses of the verb *insist* (s.v. *insist*). First, the sense "to stand or rest *on* or *upon*", which has become obsolete. However, since the *OED* shows that *insist* has still been used in this sense in the 19th century, it will be interesting to see whether the data from the CLMETEV includes any examples of this use. The second sense of *insist* is "to continue steadfastly or persist *in* a course of action, to follow steadfastly *in* (*on*) a person's steps, etc.; to continue with urgency; to persevere". This use is now considered archaic. *Insist* was also formerly used as a transitive verb in the sense "to follow *in* (a person's steps)". According to the *OED*, the third sense of *insist* is "to dwell at length or with emphasis *on* or *upon* a matter; hence, to insist *on* = to assert or maintain persistently". "To take one's stand *on* (*in*) a point" is another sense of *insist* that has become

obsolete. The fourth sense of the verb *insist* is "to make a demand with persistent urgency; to take a persistent or peremptory stand in regard to a stipulation, claim, demand, proposal, etc."

Senses	Quotes	Complements
1. <i>intr.</i> To stand or rest <i>on</i> or <i>upon</i> . <i>Obs.</i>	1656 HOBBS <i>Elem. Philos</i> Two strait lines meeting in the circumference of a circle and <i>insisting</i> upon equal arches. 1709-29 V. MANDEY <i>Syst. Math., Geom.</i> Angles likewise which <i>insist</i> on the Diameter, are all Right Angles.	<i>upon</i> + NP <i>on</i> + NP
2.a. <i>intr.</i> To continue steadfastly or persist <i>in</i> a course of action, to follow steadfastly <i>in</i> (<i>on</i>) a person's steps, etc.; to continue with urgency; to persevere. <i>arch.</i> b. <i>trans.</i> To follow in (a person's steps). <i>Obs.</i>	1638 F. JUNIUS <i>Paint. of Ancients</i> To caste our eyes upon Nature, and to <i>insist</i> in her steps. 1680 H. DODWELL <i>Two Lett.</i> Many of the primitive Hereticks.. exactly <i>insisted</i> on their footsteps. 1631 R. H. <i>Arraignm. Whole Creature</i> Wee <i>insist</i> their steps, whether crooked or straight.	<i>in</i> + NP <i>on</i> + NP NP <i>Obs.</i>
3.a. <i>intr.</i> To dwell at length or with emphasis <i>on</i> or <i>upon</i> a matter; hence, to insist on = to assert or maintain persistently. Formerly, also, to take one's stand <i>on</i> (<i>in</i>) a point. <i>Obs.</i> b. with clause: To maintain persistently or positively <i>that</i> a thing is so. c. with quoted words	1609 B. JONSON <i>Case is Altered</i> I cannot now <i>insist</i> upon particulars. 1713 BERKELEY <i>Hylas & Phil.</i> I shall <i>insist</i> no longer on that point. 1818 CRUISE <i>Digest</i> It was <i>insisted</i> that the testator had restrained the estate of inheritance during her life. 1888 MRS. H. WARD <i>R. Elsmere</i> 'And rather than try,' he <i>insisted</i> , 'you will go on believing [etc.]'	<i>upon</i> + NP <i>on</i> + NP <i>in</i> + NP <i>Obs.</i> <i>of</i> + NP <i>Obs.</i> <i>that</i> -clause zero complement
4.a. To make a demand with persistent urgency; to take a persistent or peremptory stand in regard to a stipulation, claim, demand, proposal, etc. b. with <i>that</i> and clause	1623 LD. HERBERT <i>Orig. Lett.</i> That the sayd Kinge of Spaine would never <i>insiste</i> upon obtaininge those priviledges. 1647 CLARENDON <i>Hist. Reb.</i> This condition should be first humbly <i>insisted</i> on. 1875 W. S. HAYWARD <i>Love agst. World</i> Since, you <i>insist</i> , I cannot help it. 1883 FROUDE <i>Short Stud.</i> The king <i>insisted</i> that a sacred profession should not be used as a screen for the protection of felony.	<i>upon</i> + <i>ing</i> -clause <i>on</i> + NP zero complement <i>for</i> + NP <i>Obs.</i> <i>against</i> + <i>ing</i> -clause <i>Obs.</i> <i>to</i> -infinitive <i>Obs.</i> <i>that</i> -clause

Table 1: Senses and complements of *insist* in the OED

4.2 The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*

The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* gives two main senses for *insist*: "to demand that something happens or that somebody agrees to do something" and "to say firmly that something is true, especially when other people do not believe you" (s.v. *insist*). These senses quite clearly correspond to senses 4 and 3 in the *OED*. According to the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, *on* + NP complements (2a), zero complements (2b) and *that*-clause complements (1a) occur in both senses. *Insist* can also have *on* + *poss ing* and *on* + *acc ing* complements (1b) in the first sense. The following examples are from the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, (1a) and (1b) exemplifying the first sense and (2a) and (2b) the second sense:

- (1) a. He *insists* that she come.
- b. She *insisted* on his/him wearing a suit.
- (2) a. He *insisted* on his innocence.
- b. 'It's true,' she *insisted*.

The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* also gives two instances of what the authors call "phrasal verbs": "*insist on/upon* something", meaning "to demand something and refuse to be persuaded to accept anything else", and "*insist on* doing something", meaning "to continue doing something even though other people think it is annoying".

4.3 The *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*

According to the *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, the meaning of *insist* is "to state or demand forcefully, especially despite opposition" (s.v. *insist*). This meaning clearly includes the two senses that are given in the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. The following examples are all from the *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*:

- (3) a. Greg still *insists* (that) he did nothing wrong.
 b. She *insisted* on seeing her lawyer.
 c. Please go first. - I *insist*!

The sense "to state forcefully" is exemplified by the first sentence (3a), in which the complement of *insist* is a *that*-clause, introduced either by *that* or Ø. In the other two examples, *insist* has the meaning "to demand forcefully", and the complements given for *insist* in this sense are an *on* + *ing*-clause complement (3b), and a zero complement (3c).

4.4 Grammars

According to Poutsma, "verbs and (participial) adjectives with *on* as a rule take a gerund(-clause)", which is also the case with *insist* (4) (1904, 663). Huddleston and Pullum also mention the *on* + *ing*-clause construction as a possible complement of *insist* (2002, 840). Other complements of *insist* mentioned by Poutsma are *that*-clauses (5) and subordinate statements announced by a preposition + *it* in the higher sentence (6) (1904, 179-180). However, with *insist*, "this announcing of the subordinate statement is but rarely met with" (Poutsma 1904, 180). Poutsma also says that *poss ing* and *acc ing*-constructions, or "gerund clauses with a subject-indicating word in the function of the prepositional object" are very common, and he gives an example of *insist* in an *on* + *acc ing*-construction (7) (1904, 713-714):

- (4) He *insisted* on helping his friends. (Snobs, Ch. 1, 17)
 (5) I *insist* that you shall sing no song in public which I have not previously heard.
 (Ill. Mag.)
 (6) Will Stutely *insisted* upon it that he must be rechristened. (Robin Hood)
 (7) He *insisted* on his sisters accepting the invitation. (Mrs Bouv., 82)

We shall later see if the results I get from the data from the CLMETEV and the BNC support Poutsma's observations.

According to Quirk et al., *insist* commonly introduces a *that*-clause (1985, 157). Quirk et al. also point out that *insist on* is a prepositional verb, and that "when a prepositional verb is followed

by a *that*-clause or a *to*-infinitive clause, the preposition disappears, and the prepositional object merges with the direct object of the monotransitive pattern” (1985, 1178). However, the omitted preposition can reappear in the corresponding passive (Quirk et al. 1985, 1178), as in:

(8) That he should leave at once was *insisted* (on).

Biber et al. also mention *that*-clauses as possible complements of *insist*. In addition, they also point out that *insist* is relatively common in the construction *insist* + *to* NP + *that*-clause (1999, 663). Huddleston and Pullum also discuss this construction. They point out that *to* + NP here is an optional PP complement of *insist*, and that the NP in the *to* phrase “indicates the recipient of some act of communication” (2002, 959). Huddleston and Pullum also mention the *insist* + *on* + NP construction, when they discuss obliques and objects. They define an oblique as “the complement of the preposition governed by a prepositional verb”, and claim that in the *insist* + *on* + NP construction, the NP is “an oblique, a complement of the preposition *on* rather than of the verb *insist*” (2002, 1019). However, when I analyze my own data from the CLMETEV and the BNC, I intend to include the NPs in the complementation patterns of *insist*, and treat such constructions as *on* + NP complements, for example.

5. Factors bearing on complementation

In this chapter, I will introduce certain factors that may have an effect on the complementation of the verb *insist*.

5.1 The Complexity Principle

The *complexity principle* states that "in case of more or less explicit grammatical options the more explicit one(s) will tend to be favored in cognitively more complex environments" (Rohdenburg 1996, 151). According to Rohdenburg, there are certain factors that make a sentence more complex, including the length of the subjects, objects and subordinate clauses in question, various kinds of discontinuous constructions and passive constructions (1996, 149). The more explicit grammatical option which tends to occur in sentences that include such complexity factors is generally the bulkier construction. Therefore, in the case of *insist*, *upon* + NP complements should be used more than *on* + NP complements, and *that*-clauses should be more common than *to*-infinitives and *ing*-clauses in complex environments. It will be interesting to see if this is indeed the case in the data from the CLMETEV and the BNC.

5.2 Extractions

The *extraction principle* may also influence the selection of complements. According to the extraction principle, when there is a choice between infinitival and gerundial complements, "the (perfect) infinitive will tend to be favoured in environments where the object of the dependent verb is extracted ... from its original position and crosses clause boundaries" (Vosberg 2003, 202). These kinds of deviations from the canonical sentence structure are called *extractions*, and the different types of structures involving extractions include topicalization, relativization, clefting,

comparativization and interrogation (Vosberg 2003, 201-202). It is probable that the extraction principle will not influence the selection of complements for *insist* because, according to the *OED*, *to*-infinitives are no longer used as complements of *insist*. Nevertheless, I am interested to see what kinds of extractions can be found in the data, and which complementation patterns tend to occur in sentences involving extractions.

5.3 The Great Complement Shift

Over the past few centuries, there have been some major changes in the sentential complementation of English (Rohdenburg 2006, 143). These changes, which have resulted in “a reorganization of the entire system of sentential complementation” in English, are often referred to as the Great Complement Shift (Vosberg 2009, 212). Perhaps the most important process, and also the most relevant to this thesis, involves the rise of gerundial complements at the expense of infinitives and *that*-clauses, as shown in example (1) (Rohdenburg 2006, 143):

(1) She delighted to do it. → She delighted in doing it.

Even if *to*-infinitives have indeed become obsolete in the complementation of *insist*, the verb does take *that*-clauses and *ing*-clauses as its complements. For this reason, when I analyze my data, I will be interested to see whether the Great Complement Shift has also affected the complementation of *insist* by increasing the use of *ing*-clause complements at the expense of *that*-clause complements.

5.4 The *horror aequi* principle

Rohdenburg defines the *horror aequi* principle as involving “the widespread (and presumably universal) tendency to avoid the use of formally (near-) identical and (near-) adjacent (non-coordinate) grammatical elements or structures” (2003, 236). This means that, for example, it is less

likely that a *to*-infinitive is followed by another *to*-infinitive than some other grammatical element. In the case of *insist*, it is probable that there will not be any sequences of *to*-infinitives in the data, but it is, however, possible to find near-adjacent *ing*-patterns in the data, such as in the following invented example:

(2) She was *insisting* on doing it herself.

With *insist*, there is always a preposition before an *ing*-clause complement, and in such cases it is not possible to have two *ing*-forms immediately one after another. However, they can be near-adjacent, like in the above example, and the *horror aequi* principle should apply in such cases as well. Therefore, when I analyze the data from the CLMETEV and the BNC, I will see if any violations of the *horror aequi* principle can be found in the data.

6. The CLMETEV: Part One (1710-1780)

This chapter will present the analysis of the authentic data from the first part of the CLMETEV, which includes texts from the period 1710-1780, and contains 3,037,607 words in total. First, I will examine and count the different complements of *insist* in the data. After that, I will analyze the different senses of *insist* that can be found in the data, and see whether a certain complement is used with a certain sense of *insist*. I will also compare the ideas and principles found in the previous literature to the data from the first part of the CLMETEV.

6.1 The complementation patterns found in the data

The search for the base form and the inflected forms of *insist* yielded a total of 247 tokens. The following table shows the different complementation patterns of *insist* found in the first part of the CLMETEV. Raw and normalized frequencies and percentages of each complement are also presented in the table.

Complement	Raw frequency	Normalized frequency per million words	Percentage
<i>upon</i> + NP	48	15.8	19,4%
<i>on</i> + NP	48	15.8	19,4%
<i>upon</i> + <i>poss ing</i>	39	12.8	15,8%
<i>that</i> -clause	34	11.2	13,8%
<i>upon</i> + <i>ing</i> -clause	33	10.9	13,4%
<i>on</i> + <i>ing</i> -clause	14	4.6	5,7%
<i>on</i> + <i>poss ing</i>	11	3.6	4,5%
zero complement	4	1.3	1,6%
<i>upon</i> + <i>it</i> + <i>that</i> -clause	4	1.3	1,6%
<i>on</i> + <i>it</i> + <i>that</i> -clause	2	0.7	0,8%
<i>to</i> -infinitive	2	0.7	0,8%
<i>upon</i> + <i>poss ing</i> OR <i>acc ing</i>	2	0.7	0,8%
<i>on</i> + <i>poss ing</i> OR <i>acc ing</i>	2	0.7	0,8%

<i>on + acc ing</i>	1	0.3	0,4%
<i>upon + acc ing</i>	1	0.3	0,4%
<i>upon + it + to-infinitive</i>	1	0.3	0,4%
<i>upon + wh-clause</i>	1	0.3	0,4%
Total	247	81.3	100%

Table 2: CLMETEV 1710-1780: raw and normalized frequencies and percentages of the different complements of *insist*

6.1.1 Non-sentential complements

As can be seen in the table above, the data included several types of complementation patterns of *insist*. I will first take a look at the non-sentential complements found in the data. The most common non-sentential complements were clearly the PP complements, *upon + NP* and *on + NP*, with 48 tokens each, and a normalized frequency of 15.8 (1-2).

- (1) My dear Pamela, said my master, if you proceed at this rate, I must *insist upon your first seven days*. (Richardson 1740)
- (2) By *insisting on the divorce of Helena*, Diocletian acknowledged her marriage. (Gibbon 1776)

The nouns in the NPs varied considerably, but there were some nouns that occurred more than once. Among these nouns were, for example, *topic*, *thing*, *argument*, *principle*, *company*, *promise* and *answer* (3). The pronoun *it* was particularly common in the NPs, as it occurred eleven times (4). Most of the nouns were [+abstract], such as *truth*, *difficulty*, *blindness*, *deceitfulness*, *clearness* and *goodness* (5), but the NPs also included some [-abstract] nouns, such as *garters*, *furniture* and *stock* (6). In addition, there was one instance in which the noun in the NP was [+human] (7).

- (3) But I *insist upon your answer*, replied he. (Richardson 1740)
- (4) “I wish you would lie a night there; but I do not *insist upon it*.” (Reeve 1777)
- (5) ... the youngest pleaded her youth, and the eldest her age; one *insisted on her goodness*, another from her meekness claimed a title to preference... (Fielding 1749)
- (6) ... in which he *insisted on the furniture and stock of the farm*, in consideration of the arrears. (Reeve 1777)

- (7) Not to *insist on* Homer and the poets, we may observe, that historians scruple not to mention... (Hume 1751)

When *insist* takes no complements at all, it can be said to have a zero complement (8). The zero complement is here regarded as a special type of non-sentential complement. There were only four examples of this complement in the data (NF 1.3). In this thesis, I have also decided to count quotes as zero complements, even though Herbst et al. consider quotes to be a separate complementation pattern of *insist* (2004, 432). Only one quote was found in the data from the CLMETEV1 (NF 0.3) (9).

- (8) She blushed, and hesitated to tell him all that passed between them; but he begged, persuaded, *insisted*; and, at length... (Reeve 1777)
 (9) And the liker the better, *insisted* PHILO. (Hume 1779)

Included in the zero complements is one example of an *as*-clause:

- (10) ... hot in dispute with the innkeeper concerning a horse which he had hired of him, and, as the other *insisted*, drove so hard that he had killed him. (Haywood 1744)

6.1.2 Sentential complements

The *upon + poss ing* complement was clearly the most common sentential complement, which supports Poutsma's findings about how common "gerund clauses with a subject-indicating word in the function of the prepositional object" are in the complementation of *insist*, or at least were in the 18th century. However, with 39 tokens the *upon + poss ing* complement (11) is clearly much more common (NF 12.8) than the other complements that include *poss ing* and *acc ing* constructions.

- (11) He *insists upon my giving a twenty-four sols piece*, which is too much by two-thirds, in all conscience. (Smollett 1751)

Other common sentential complementation patterns were *that*-clauses (12) with 34 tokens (NF 11.2), and *upon + ing*-clause complements (13) with 33 tokens (NF 10.9). In 10 tokens *that*-

clauses were introduced by Ø (14). There were also two cases where *insist upon* was followed by a *that*-clause. These cases were regarded as special instances of *that*-clauses because the simple version of (15) could be *I insist (upon) that ambition, revenge, benevolence...*, thus deleting the preposition *upon*, and leaving only the *that*-clause as a complement. This supports what Quirk et al. say about prepositional verbs followed by a *that*-clause or a *to*-infinitive clause (see 4.4).

- (12) ... I must absolutely *insist* that honest Mr Williams shall be rewarded for his fidelity
(Goldsmith 1766)
- (13) Lord Falmouth has absolutely refused, and *insists* upon choosing one of his own brothers. (Walpole 1735-48)
- (14) But, if my dearest please, I will *insist* it shall be with you at the same time".
(Richardson 1740)
- (15) All that is here *insisted* upon is that ambition, revenge, benevolence... (Butler 1726)

The complementation patterns *on* + *ing*-clause (16) and *on* + *poss ing* (17) were also relatively common. However, *on* + *ing*-clause complements with 14 tokens (NF 4.6) were much rarer than *upon* + *ing*-clause complements (NF 10.9), and *on* + *poss ing* complements with 11 tokens (NF 3.6) were less common than *upon* + *poss ing* complements (NF 12.8).

- (16) ...and this confidence was followed by a struggle of generosity, each *insisting* on yielding her claim to her friend. (Walpole 1764)
- (17) I *insist* on your taking it as your own and using whatever you want of it.
(Fielding 1751)

It is also noteworthy that the only clear violation of the *horror aequi* principle in the data from the first part of the CLMETEV occurred when the verb form *insisting* had an *on* + *ing*-clause complement (18). As already noted in 5.4, there is always a preposition before an *ing*-clause complement with *insist*, and in such cases it is not possible to have two *ing*-forms immediately one after another. The two *ing*-forms can be near-adjacent, however, which is also the case in (18), where the preposition *on* is the only word between the two *ing*-forms. Because of this, it can be said that the *horror aequi* principle has been violated in (18). In addition, there were also four other cases in the data, in which the *horror aequi* principle was not as clearly violated as in (18). This is

because more than one word had been inserted between the *ing*-forms in those sentences, placing the *ing*-forms further away from each other. In those four cases, *insist* either had an *on* + *poss ing* (19) or an *upon* + *poss ing* complement (20), or an *upon* + *poss ing* OR *acc ing* complement preceded by an insertion between *insist* and its complement (21), or the word *not* had been inserted between the preposition *on* and the *ing*-clause (22). Seeing that there was only one clear violation against the *horror aequi* principle in the data (NF 0.3), it can be said that placing near-identical structures in very close succession was clearly avoided in the 18th century.

- (18) ..., each *insisting on yielding her claim to her friend*. (Walpole 1764)
- (19) ..., and *insisting on my going immediately to service*. (Fielding 1751)
- (20) ..., were *insisting upon his holding up both his hands during the representation*. (Sterne 1768)
- (21) When, on my *insisting*, as I did to you, *upon her speaking the truth*... (Fielding 1749)
- (22) ..., each *insisting on not being in fault*... (Fielding 1749)

I will now look at some of the rarer patterns of complementation, the first of which are *upon* + *it* + *that*-clause complements (23). Only four examples were found of this pattern (NF 1.3).

- (23) But I *insist upon it that pleasures are very combinable with both business and studies*... (Chesterfield 1746-71)

There were also two instances of the *on* + *it* + *that*-clause complement (24) in the data (NF 0.7). My findings clearly support Poutsma's claim that the announcing of the subordinate statement by a preposition + *it* is rare with *insist*.

- (24) ... but he *insisted on it, that they were in the right road*, and added... (Fielding 1749)

There were also two tokens with the *to*-infinitive complement in the data (25-26), even though the *OED* says that *to*-infinitives have become obsolete as complements of *insist*. However, the *OED* did have one example of the *to*-infinitive complement from the year 1749, which is why it is not that surprising to find *to*-infinitives in CLMETEV1. The normalized frequency of the *to*-infinitives was 0.7.

- (25) She *insisted*, therefore, to be raised up in her bed, that she might bless God for it upon her knees... (Doddridge 1750)
 (26) Mrs. Honour *insisted* still to have him called, saying... (Fielding 1749)

Other rare patterns of complementation included the *on* + *poss ing* OR *acc ing* (27) and *upon* + *poss ing* OR *acc ing* complements (28), both occurring two times in the data (NF 0.7). In those four cases it was impossible to determine whether the complement was a *poss ing* or *acc ing* complement because of the word *her*, which can occur in both accusative and possessive *ing*-clause constructions.

- (27) ...and all the noise you heard, said he, was only because I *insisted* on her going to bed! (Haywood 1744)
 (28) ...but my wife, who during her pregnancy had been reading romances, *insisted* upon her being called Olivia. (Goldsmith 1766)

The least common complements were *upon* + *wh*-clause complements (29), *on* + *acc ing* (30) and *upon* + *acc ing* complements (31) and *upon* + *it* + *to*-infinitive complements (32). Only one token of each these complementation patterns were found in the data (NF 0.3). However, it should be noted that the *upon* + *it* + *to*-infinitive complement in (32) might also be an *upon* + NP complement if the *to*-infinitive is not a complement of *insist*.

- (29) ... it is too manifest to be *insisted* upon how much the enjoyments of life would be increased. (Butler 1726)
 (30) This young man spoke as well as ever anyone spoke in his own defence *insisted* on the petition being heard... (Walpole 1735-48)
 (31) But when you come to Paris, from whence the letters arrive here very regularly, I shall *insist* upon you writing to me constantly once a week... (Chesterfield 1746-71)
 (32) I must *insist* upon it, therefore, to make your present habitation as easy to you as possible... (Fielding 1751)

As was pointed out in 5.1, discontinuous constructions form a complexity factor, and may therefore affect the choice of complements. Such discontinuous constructions may be caused by insertions, for example. I use the term *insertion* here when referring to instances where material has been inserted between the matrix verb and its complement. The data also included some cases

where something had been inserted in the middle of the complement, but they are not regarded as cases of insertion here. Here is, however, one example of such a construction:

- (33) ... I can scarcely conceive anything more completely imprudent than for the head of the empire to *insist* that, if any privilege is pleaded against his will or his acts, his whole authority is denied... (Burke 1775)

There were altogether 21 insertions in the data. In six of the tokens, insertion occurred in sentences with a *that*-clause complement (34). There were also six cases of insertion in sentences with the non-sentential *on* + NP complement (35) and three cases in sentences with the *upon* + NP complement (36). In addition, insertion was also found with *to*-infinitives. In fact, something had been inserted between *insist* and its complement in both of the two cases where *insist* had a *to*-infinitive complement (25-26). This could be just a coincidence, seeing that there were only two *to*-infinitive complements in the data. However, it is still an interesting point to make. Insertion was also found in sentences with *upon* + *poss ing* complements (2 tokens) (37), *upon* + *ing*-clause complements (1 token) (38) and *on* + *ing*-clause complements (1 token) (39).

- (34) ... and *insisted*, by all the tenderness which had ever been between us, that I would take on myself the management... (Haywood 1744)
 (35) I *insist* but on the former, resumed he... (Haywood 1744)
 (36) ... could not but *insist* mostly upon considerations of this latter kind. (Butler 1726)
 (37) But the Dutch gentlemen, who had no idea of his sufferings, *insisted*, with suprising obstinacy of regard, upon his staying... (Smollett 1751)
 (38) He *insists*, as you will find, upon being answered in verse... (Chesterfield 1746-71)
 (39) ..., and he likewise *insisted* (notwithstanding all I could say to the contrary), on putting a Soldier into the Boats... (Cook 1768-71)

According to the complexity principle, the more explicit grammatical option will tend to be favored in cognitively more complex environments. However, this does not seem to be the case with *insist* because *on* + NP complements were twice as common as *upon* + NP complements when there was something inserted between *insist* and its complement. What seems to support the complexity principle, however, is that insertion occurred more often in sentences with *that*-clause

complements (6 tokens), which are more explicit than the other sentential complements, than in sentences with *poss ing* and *ing*-clause complements (4 tokens).

It is, however, also important to look at the length of the insertions to see whether more complex insertions occur with more explicit complement types. In the data, the length of the insertions did not seem to influence the choice between the non-sentential PP complements, *on* + NP and *upon* + NP, as they both occurred only with short insertions, consisting of three words or less (35-36). However, the situation was clearly different with sentential complements. The explicit *that*-clauses occurred with both short and long insertions, ranging from one word to ten words (34). On the other hand, it was quite surprising to see that the less explicit *ing*-clause and *poss ing* complements all occurred with relatively long insertions, ranging from four words to eight words. It is also worth noting that the less explicit *on* + *ing*-clause complement occurred with a much longer insertion (8 words) (39) than the more explicit *upon* + *ing*-clause complement (4 words) (38), which goes against the complexity principle. In addition, it was quite surprising that *to*-infinitives, which are less explicit than *that*-clauses but more explicit than *ing*-clauses, occurred only with insertions that consisted of one word only (25-26). This could be a coincidence, however, as there were only two *to*-infinitive complements in the data.

Passive constructions form another complexity factor that may affect the choice of complements. There were 22 passive constructions in the data. When I analyzed them, I related them to the corresponding actives because “active and passive sentences are derived from the same underlying structures” (Perlmutter & Soames 1979, 30). Again, the results that I obtained from the data do not support the complexity principle because by far the most common complement in passive sentences was the *on* + NP complement (40) with fifteen tokens. There were only three passive sentences that included the *upon* + NP complement (41), which is the more explicit one of the two PP complements. There were also two passive sentences with a *that*-clause complement. In addition, one example was found of both the *upon* + *wh*-clause complement and the *upon* + *it* +

that-clause complement in passive sentences.

- (40) The blindness, unconstancy, and deceitfulness of the latter have been as strongly *insisted on*. (Hume 1739-40)
- (41) ...and those it commands are more strongly *insisted upon*, when they happen not to be commanded by law. (Chesterfield 1746-71)

6.2 Sense and structure

By far the most common sense of *insist* in the data was the *OED* sense 4, "to make a demand with persistent urgency; to take a persistent or peremptory stand in regard to a stipulation, claim, demand, proposal, etc." There were 177 examples of *insist* in this sense, which represents approximately 71,7 percent of all the tokens:

- (42) "Nay then," said the other, "I *insist upon knowing what you mean*." (Fielding 1751)
- (43) Lord Graham *insisted upon their going all to his castle*... (Reeve 1777)
- (44) Friends should not *insist upon Ceremonies*. (Gay 1728)
- (45) I *insist*, therefore, that you wash your teeth the first thing you do every morning... (Chesterfield 1746-71)
- (46) "...but I *insist upon it that you do not deceive me in any particular*." (Fielding 1751)

The *OED* sense 3, "to dwell at length or with emphasis *on* or *upon* a matter; hence, to insist on = to assert or maintain persistently" was also relatively common in the data with 69 tokens, which is 27,9 percent of the total amount of tokens:

- (47) "It *insists* also, that we should be at liberty either to seek or to reject employments..." (Chesterfield 1746-71)
- (48) My wife very strenuously *insisted upon the advantages that would result from it*. (Goldsmith 1766)
- (49) It is only a false delicacy, he may *insist*, which a few refined spirits indulge... (Hume 1779)
- (50) ...for each *insisted on it, that she was not to blame; but that the whole quarrel arose from the faults of others*. (Fielding 1749)

There seems to be a grey area between the *OED* senses 3 and 4, and it was quite difficult to figure out the sense of *insist* in some cases. In (51), for example, the amendment can either be

discussed at length or demanded with urgency. Fortunately, in most cases the context gave an important clue as to which sense was used in which sentence.

- (51) They *insisted* on this amendment, and debated it till seven at night, not one professed Jacobite speaking. (Walpole 1735-48)

What also helped distinguish between the two senses was that when *insist* was used in sense 4, it often seemed to involve a stronger element of disagreement than it did in sense 3. This can be seen in the following examples, in the first of which *insist* is used in sense 3 and in the second one in sense 4 (52-53):

- (52) The whole argument, which I have been now *insisting* upon, may be thus summed up, and given you in one view. (Butler 1726)
 (53) I begged excuse; but he *insisted* upon it. (Richardson 1740)

The distinction between the two senses was a lot easier to make with *that*-clauses. This is because, in most cases, when *insist* has a *that*-clause complement when it is used in the *OED* sense 3, the speaker clearly insists persistently that something is the case (54), whereas in sense 4 the speaker demands that something be done (55).

- (54) They *insisted*, that as their church was the first, so it was the best... (Cibber 1753)
 (55) I *insist*, that henceforward, he obey the rules of this assembly... (Johnson 1740-1)

The *OED* sense 2, "to continue steadfastly or persist *in* a course of action, to follow steadfastly *in* (*on*) a person's steps, etc.; to continue with urgency; to persevere", was also rather problematic, but I believe that I found one example of *insist* in this sense, which therefore represents 0,4 percent of all the tokens in the data (56). The token includes the *upon* + *ing*-clause complement, which is not mentioned in the *OED* as one of the complementation patterns of *insist* in this sense:

- (56) Mr Smollet calls him the admiral, because he *insists* upon steering his pleasure-boat upon the lake... (Smollett 1771)

Every *upon/on* + *poss ing* and *upon/on* + *acc ing* complement, and almost all *upon/on* + *ing*-clause complements occurred in sentences where *insist* was used in sense 4. There was only one example in which *insist* chose the *upon* + *ing*-clause complement when it was used in sense 2 (56), and one example of the *on* + *ing*-clause complement when *insist* was used in sense 3 (57).

(57) Such like defences they would all have made for themselves, each *insisting on not being in fault*, and throwing the blame on her companion... (Fielding 1749)

In addition, the *upon* + NP complement (35 tokens) was clearly more common than the *on* + NP complement (16 tokens) when *insist* was used in sense 4, and this was reversed when *insist* was used in sense 3 (32 *on* + NP complements and 13 *upon* + NP complements). There were no other major differences in complementation between the different senses, but it is worth mentioning that all *to*-infinitive and *upon* + *it* + *to*-infinitive complements were found with sense 4, whereas all *on* + *it* + *that*-clause complements and *upon* + *wh*-clause complements occurred with sense 3.

No examples were found of the *OED* sense 1, "to stand or rest *on* or *upon*", which shows how rare the sense has been already in the 18th century.

6.3 Extractions

There were altogether 20 cases of extraction in the data. The most common structure involving extraction was relativization with 13 tokens. It is a process, which "moves the relative pronoun from its deep structure position into its surface position in C(omp)", and thus creates a relative clause (Huang 1997, 131). The *on* + NP complement with 7 tokens was the most frequent complementation pattern in these sentences (58). Other patterns were the *upon* + NP complement with 3 tokens (59), *that*-clauses introduced by Ø with 2 tokens (60), and the *on* + *ing*-clause complement with one token (61). There was also one token in which the process involving extraction resembles relativization very closely, with *as* functioning as a relative pronoun (62). This

possibility is also mentioned by Quirk et al. when they point out that *as* can function as “a special type of relative pronoun in restrictive clauses” (1972, 873).

- (58) But the topics of praise, which we *insist on*... (Hume 1751)
- (59) The subject we have been *insisting upon* would lead us into the same kind of reflections by a different connection. (Butler 1726)
- (60) ... but in the Meantime they had put a Guard into the Boat, which Mr. Hicks *insisted should be order'd out*... (Cook 1768-71)
- (61) Sour krout; the unsavoury portable soups of that day; the strange greens that Cook *insisted on hunting up* at every land he visited... (Cook 1768-71)
- (62) ... without having recourse to any such intelligent creator as you *insist on*, may be difficult to determine. (Hume 1779)

There were also four tokens that involved *wh*-movement. It is a transformational process in which “a *wh*-word is first generated in the base (at D-Structure) as a constituent within S, and then moved to the Comp position” (Huang 1997, 124). In all of these cases, the complement was a non-sentential PP: the *on* + NP complement in three tokens (63), and the *upon* + NP complement in one token (64).

- (63) This may also serve in another view to illustrate what I have *insisted on* concerning the origin of pride and humility, love and hatred. (Hume 1739-40)
- (64) I will now tell you what I expect and *insist upon* from you at Turin... (Chesterfield 1746-71)

The data also included two tokens with pseudo-cleft movement (65-66). Both of these sentences included the *upon* + NP complement.

- (65) ... for 'tis what I *insist upon*, for my own reputation... (Richardson 1740)
- (66) All that remains for me then to wish, to recommend, to inculcate, to order, and to *insist upon*, is good-breeding... (Chesterfield 1746-71)

In the data, the *on* + NP complement, which occurred in 11 out of the 20 tokens involving extractions, was clearly the most common complementation pattern in sentences that included such deviations from the canonical sentence structure. In six tokens, the complement was the *upon* + NP complement. The fact that the *on* + NP complement was so much more frequent in complex

sentences involving extractions than the more explicit *upon* + NP complement goes against the complexity principle. On the other hand, *that*-clauses were slightly more common (2 tokens) than the less explicit *ing*-clause complements (1 token) in such sentences, which supports the complexity principle. The fact that extractions occurred only once with gerundial complements, which represents 5 percent of all the extractions in the data from CLMETEV1, is an interesting one because it suggests that gerunds are resistant to extractions. This is also pointed out in the extraction principle, which says that when there is a choice between infinitival and gerundial complements, infinitives tend to be favoured in environments where an element has been extracted from its original position (see 5.2). In the data from the first part of the CLMETEV, no extractions occurred when *insist* had an infinitival complement, which is not surprising seeing as *to*-infinitives occurred only twice in the complementation of *insist*.

7. The CLMETEV: Part Three (1850-1920)

This chapter will present the analysis of the authentic data from the third sub-section of the CLMETEV, which includes texts from the period 1850-1920, and contains 6,251,564 words in total. I will first examine and count the different complements of *insist* in the data. After that, I will analyze the different senses of *insist* that can be found in the data, and see whether any complementation patterns tend to occur with a particular sense of *insist*. I will also compare the ideas and principles found in the previous literature to the data from the third part of the CLMETEV.

7.1 The complementation patterns found in the data

The search for the base form and the inflected forms of *insist* returned a total of 441 tokens. In one of the tokens, however, the form *insisting* was used as an adjective:

- (1) ...assembly under such a threat cannot arrest, and could not be intended to arrest, a determined and *insisting* executive. (Bagehot 1867)

Because this thesis focuses only on the complementation patterns of the verb *insist*, the token was discarded from the data. Therefore, the number of relevant tokens from the third part of the CLMETEV is 440. Table 3 shows the different complementation patterns of *insist* found in the third part of the CLMETEV, as well as their raw and normalized frequencies and percentages.

Complement	Raw frequency	Normalized frequency per million words	Percentage
<i>on</i> + <i>ing</i> -clause	90	14.4	20,5%
<i>on</i> + NP	86	13.8	19,5%
zero complement	64	10.2	14,5%
<i>that</i> -clause	63	10.1	14,3%
<i>upon</i> + NP	52	8.3	11,8%
<i>on</i> + <i>poss ing</i>	31	5.0	7,0%
<i>upon</i> + <i>ing</i> -clause	23	3.7	5,2%
<i>on</i> + <i>acc ing</i>	7	1.1	1,6%
<i>upon</i> + <i>poss ing</i>	5	0.8	1,1%
<i>on</i> + <i>it</i> + <i>that</i> -clause	5	0.8	1,1%
<i>on</i> + <i>poss ing</i> OR <i>acc ing</i>	4	0.6	0,9%
<i>to</i> -infinitive	2	0.3	0,5%
<i>upon</i> + <i>acc ing</i>	1	0.2	0,2%
<i>upon</i> + <i>poss ing</i> OR <i>acc ing</i>	1	0.2	0,2%
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>that</i> -clause	1	0.2	0,2%
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>upon</i> + NP	1	0.2	0,2%
<i>to</i> + NP + <i>on</i> + <i>ing</i> -clause	1	0.2	0,2%
<i>against</i> + NP	1	0.2	0,2%
<i>upon</i> + <i>it</i> + <i>that</i> -clause	1	0.2	0,2%
<i>upon</i> + <i>it</i> + <i>as</i> + AdjP	1	0.2	0,2%
Total	440	70.7	100%

Table 3: CLMETEV 1850-1920: raw and normalized frequencies and percentages of the different complements of *insist*

7.1.1 Non-sentential complements

The most common non-sentential complement was the *on* + NP complement with 86 tokens (2). It is worth noting that even though they were equally common in the first part of the CLMETEV, in the third part the *on* + NP complement was clearly more common (NF 13.8) than the *upon* + NP complement (NF 8.3), which occurred 52 times in the data (3).

- (2) “I said it was his hat. Or, if you *insist* on a shade of difference, a hat that is his.”
(Chesterton 1914)
- (3) He determines, come what may, to *insist* upon a change. (Jerome 1909)

Again, the NPs included a wide selection of nouns. Nouns that occurred more than once in the NPs included, for example, *thing*, *fact*, *right*, *principle*, *condition* and *necessity* (4). Pronouns were also particularly common in the NPs, seeing as *it* occurred 17 times, *this* 5 times, *that* twice and *those* once (5). As in the first part of the corpus, [+abstract] nouns, such as *weakness*, *power*, *equality*, *importance* and *ugliness* (6), occurred much more frequently than [-abstract] nouns, such as *text-book*, *sirloin* and *packages* (7). In addition, one example of a [+human] noun was found in the NPs (8).

- (4) The same eminent authority *insists on the necessity of an observing war balloon making short ascents*. (Bacon 1902)
- (5) "If she once gets a glimmering of your plan, she will *insist on it*, whatever becomes of me." (Webster 1884)
- (6) And if anyone asks what is the use of *insisting on the ugliness of this task of state violence* since all mankind is condemned to employ it... (Chesterton 1912)
- (7) She *insisted upon separate packages*. (Bennett 1908)
- (8) The wife lives to realize the ideal of the "ladylike"-- lady she resigns to the patrician-- and she *insists upon a servant*, however small. (Wells 1902-3)

It was surprising how much more frequently the zero complement occurred in the third part of the corpus than in the first part, where it was one of the rarer patterns of complementation with only four tokens (NF 1.3). In the third part, however, the zero complement was the third most common complement with 64 tokens (NF 10.2) (9). This seems to be an important development in the complementation of *insist*, and it will be interesting to see whether the zero complement is also common in the data from the BNC. In 42 of the 64 tokens *insist* occurred after a quote (NF 6.7), which marks a significant increase from the first part of the corpus (NF 0.3) (10).

- (9) If you *insist*, you take your unjust advantage of me, and I give way immediately. (Collins 1859-60)
- (10) 'You said you would, and you must,' *insisted* Elfride, coming to the door and speaking under her father's arm. (Hardy 1873)

Included in the zero complements are three *as*-clauses. Here is one example of such a construction:

- (11) ...and no doubt it is also true, as Mr. Wallas *insists*, that the problems of the foreign immigrant and of racial intermarriage, loom upon us. (Wells 1902-3)

In addition, there were some complementation patterns that had not occurred in the first sub-section of the CLMETEV. These were the patterns *upon* + it + as + AdjP (12) and *to* + NP + *upon* + NP, where the NP in the *to* phrase indicates the recipient of an act of communication, and is therefore [+human] (13). There was also one instance of the *against* + NP complement (14), although, according to the *OED*, the preposition *against* is no longer used in the complementation of *insist*.

- (12) St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem had *insisted upon it as necessary that even Gentile converts should abstain from things strangled*... (Butler 1903)
 (13) ...would urge that the claims of his elder brother were naturally paramount, while he *insisted to John upon the fact that he had a numerous family*... (Butler 1903)
 (14) But Croässaquagha *insisted against this discontented view*. (Webster 1884)

7.1.2 Sentential complements

In the third sub-section of the CLMETEV, the *on* + *ing*-clause complement had replaced the *on* + NP construction as the most common complement of *insist*, occurring 90 times in the data (15). It was also much more frequent in the third part of the corpus (NF 14.4) than in the first part (NF 4.6). However, the *upon* + *ing*-clause complement (16) with 23 tokens (NF 3.7) was much rarer than in the first part of the corpus (NF 10.9).

- (15) They swarmed over the carriage in noisy and rather inconvenient enthusiasm, *insisting on shaking hands with us all*... (Linton 1885)
 (16) The squire *insists upon having a full account of the money rendered to him*. (Meredith 1870)

There were seven clear violations against the *horror aequi* principle in the third part of the CLMETEV, and they all occurred in sentences where the verb form *insisting* was followed by an *on* + *ing*-clause complement (17-18). In addition, there were two other cases in which the *horror aequi* principle was not violated as clearly because in those cases more than one word had been inserted between the *ing*-forms. In those cases, the complements of *insist* were *on* + *poss ing* (19) and *to* + NP + *on* + *ing*-clause (33). Based on these results, it can be said that violations against the *horror aequi* principle were again rare in the third part of the CLMETEV. However, they were still more common in the third part than in the first part of the corpus, seeing that the NF of the clear *horror aequi* violations was 0.3 in the first part and 1.1 in the third part.

- (17) ..., and *insisting on being treated on terms of brotherly familiarity*... (Yonge 1870)
- (18) This was caused by the King Regnant's *insisting on having it instead of his doll*... (Webster 1884)
- (19) ..., the start for the gravel-pit was delayed Martha's *insisting on everybody's washing its hands*... (Nesbit 1902)

Another frequent sentential pattern of complementation was the *that*-clause complement with 63 tokens (20). There were only three cases where *that*-clauses were introduced by Ø (21).

- (20) Tom Platt *insisted that they had much better haul the thing and make a new berth*. (Kipling 1897)
- (21) There is the four-post bedstead. Your mother never liked it. She will *insist, it harbours things*. (Jerome 1909)

It is noteworthy that the NF of *that*-clauses had decreased somewhat compared to the first part of the CLMETEV, going from 11.2 to 10.1. At the same time, the NF of the *on* + *ing*-clause had increased significantly, from 4.6 to 14.4. This seems to suggest that the Great Complement Shift has also affected the complementation of *insist*, increasing the use of *ing*-clause complements at the expense of *that*-clause complements. However, the decline in the use of the *upon* + *ing*-clause complement is also worth remembering, but it is probable that it has to do with the overall decrease in the use of *upon* in the complementation of *insist*. We shall see later if this is indeed the case.

The *on + poss ing* complement was another common complement type with 31 tokens (22).

(22) You *insist* on my speaking plainly, and I have spoken plainly. (Gissing 1891)

I will now look at the rarer patterns of complementation found in the data. These included the *on + acc ing* complement with 7 tokens (23), as well as the *on + it + that*-clause (24) and the *upon + poss ing* complements (25), both with 5 tokens. It is rather surprising to see that even though the *upon + poss ing* complement was clearly the most common sentential complement in the first part of the CLMETEV (NF 12.8), it is one of the rarer patterns in the third part of the corpus (NF 0.8). This seems to confirm my earlier speculations concerning the use of *on* and *upon*: the complements that include the preposition *on* are very common in the third sub-section of the CLMETEV, whereas the ones that include the preposition *upon* are considerably less frequent than in the first part of the corpus.

(23) He wants his sausages fried to rags, yet he does not *insist* on his shirts being boiled to rags. (Chesterton 1912)

(24) ...though, as I still connected M. Boris with the affair, I *insisted* on it that he should leave the house. (Linton 1885)

(25) 'Miss Swancourt, I *insist* upon your coming down,' he exclaimed. (Hardy 1873)

The *on + poss ing* OR *acc ing* complement was another rare pattern of complementation, occurring four times in the data (26).

(26) The prisoner again *insisted* on her defining the mode of his becoming bound to the agreement. (Yonge 1865)

There were also two tokens that included the *to*-infinitive complement (27-28). Therefore, even though the *OED* says that *to*-infinitives have become obsolete as complements of *insist*, they were still used in this period, albeit extremely rarely.

(27) A splendid scene; she might well *insist* to be present. (Meredith 1895)

(28) To see her now, this girl, *insisting* to share his name,... (Meredith 1895)

The least common complementation patterns included the *upon* + *acc ing* (29), the *upon* + *poss ing* OR *acc ing* (30) and the *upon* + *it* + *that*-clause complements (31), with one token each.

(29) ...so long as the children themselves fall short of criminality, we *insist* upon the parent "keeping" the child. (Wells 1902-3)

(30) She repeated the sound resembling that which sometimes issues from the vent of a mine; but I *insisted* upon her answering. (Meredith 1870)

(31) ...not always was my flesh being made to creep by having *it* *insisted* upon that 'almost all things are by the Law purged with blood... (Gosse 1907)

There were also two complementation patterns that had not occurred in the first part of the corpus. These were the patterns *to* + NP + *that*-clause (32) and *to* + NP + *on* + *ing*-clause (33), both occurring only once in the data. The *to* + NP complement in these cases is the sort of optional complement mentioned by Huddleston and Pullum where the NP in the *to* phrase indicates the recipient of an act of communication, which is why the noun in the NPs is [+human] in both cases.

(32) "I was very blind," she said, humbly, "and now I have gone and *insisted* to poor Emily Grey that you never did any such thing." (Yonge 1865)

(33) She took out her purse and was *insisting* to Boldwood on paying for her tea for herself, when at this moment Pennyways entered the tent. (Hardy 1874)

There were 31 insertions in the data. In 15 of the tokens, insertion occurred in sentences with a *that*-clause complement (34). The less explicit *on* + *ing*-clause complement (35) occurred only two times, which supports the complexity principle. On the other hand, the *on* + NP complement (36) was also quite common in sentences that included insertions (11 tokens), whereas the more explicit PP complement, *upon* + NP (37), occurred only three times. This clearly violates the complexity principle.

(34) I have to *insist*, my dear boy, that you claim no privileges: you are apart from them. (Meredith 1870)

(35) She would often *insist* now on talking about the siege, and hearing everything that the men could tell her. (Bennett 1908)

- (36) It is most desirable to *insist*, and be tedious, on this, because our tradition ignores it. (Bagehot 1867)
- (37) If I *insist* unwearidly, nay fanatically, upon the importance of physical science as an educational agent, ... (Huxley 1894)

I also examined whether the length of an insertion had an effect on the selection of a complement type, and the results obtained clearly differ from those found in CLMETEV1 (see 6.1.2). In the data from CLMETEV3, *that*-clause complements occurred with both short and long insertions (1-8 words), whereas the *on* + *ing*-clause complement (35) only occurred with short insertions (1-3 words). It therefore seems that even though the more explicit *that*-clauses could also be used with shorter insertions, they were clearly the preferred sentential complement type with longer and more complex insertions (38), which supports the complexity principle. Interestingly, this distinction did not hold with non-sentential complements. Even though the more explicit *upon* + NP complement occurred only with longer insertions that consisted of three words or more (37), the *on* + NP complement occurred with both short and long insertions (1-7 words) (39), even though it is less explicit than *upon* + NP, and therefore should only occur in less complex environments.

- (38) For I repeat and I *insist*, and I have always held most strongly, that a tragedy such as yesterday's is not the less tragic... (Forster 1908)
- (39) Meanwhile, and until that era arrives, we can only *insist* (at any rate in our own country) on a different kind of foreign policy... (Carpenter 1915)

There were altogether 26 passives in the data. The clear majority of the passive sentences included an *on* + NP complement (14 tokens) (40), but the *upon* + NP complement (41) was also quite common (7 tokens). Based on the results from the first and third parts of the CLMETEV, it seems safe to say that the non-sentential PP complements are clearly preferred when *insist* occurs in a passive sentence. It is also important to note that the results obtained from the data go against the complexity principle because the *on* + NP complement was so much more common in passive sentences than the more explicit *upon* + NP complement.

- (40) The significance of this last remark will be *insisted on* when the writer has to tell his own experiences aloft over London... (Bacon 1902)
- (41) A certain minimum of Historical and Political reading and of general "Library" would be *insisted upon* in Section ii. (Wells 1902-3)

Other complement types that occurred in passive sentences were the *on* + *it* + *that*-clause complement with two tokens (42), and the *upon* + *it* + *that*-clause complement (43), the *that*-clause complement (44) and the zero complement (45) with one token each. It is interesting that in (45), *insist* has a zero complement in the active voice, but the omitted preposition *on* has reappeared in the corresponding passive. This possibility was also mentioned by Quirk et al. (see 4.4). However, they only pointed out that it can happen when *insist* is followed by a *that*-clause or a *to*-infinitive clause, which is not the case in (45).

- (42) It was insisted on in our household that if anything was desired... (Gosse 1907)
- (43) ... not always was my flesh being made to creep by having it insisted upon that 'almost all things are by the Law purged with blood... (Gosse 1907)
- (44) Secondly, it is *insisted that the peculiar excellence of the British Constitution lies in a balanced union of three powers*. (Bagehot 1867)
- (45) As a rule (and as has been *insisted on* before) a stationary state is by far the most frequent condition of man... (Bagehot 1869)

7.2 Sense and structure

The most common sense of *insist* in the data was, again, the *OED* sense 4, "to make a demand with persistent urgency; to take a persistent or peremptory stand in regard to a stipulation, claim, demand, proposal, etc." There were 290 examples of *insist* in this sense. This represents approximately 65,9 percent of the tokens, which is noticeably less than in the first part of the corpus (71,7 percent). Here are some examples of *insist* in the *OED* sense 4:

- (46) I went back to the doctor to tell him, by Lady Glyde's desire, that she *insisted on speaking to him immediately*. (Collins 1859-60)
- (47) The old man tried to *insist on their sitting down again*, but Janet perseveringly smiled and smiled until he stood up. (Meredith 1870)
- (48) 'No, that will not do; I *insist that you promise not to do any such absurd thing*. It is insulting me!' (Hardy 1873)

- (49) Go home and take care of yourself -- I *insist upon it*. (Gissing 1891)
 (50) "Beg for it!" he *insisted*; and His Majesty begged. (Carroll 1889)

Another common sense in the data was the *OED* sense 3, "to dwell at length or with emphasis *on* or *upon* a matter; hence, to insist on = to assert or maintain persistently". It occurred in 149 tokens, which is 33,9 percent of the total number of tokens. When compared to the corresponding percentage in the first part of the CLMETEV (27,9 percent), it can be said that the *OED* sense 3 seems to have gained more ground over the years, as opposed to sense 4.

- (51) 'If Marian *insists that it is her duty to remain with her father*, am I justified or not in freely consenting to that?' (Gissing 1891)
 (52) It cannot be too strongly *insisted on* that if the too much belauded speculations of Lana have any value at all it is that they throw... (Bacon 1902)
 (53) In this matter books, I would *insist*, have a supreme value. (Wells 1902-3)
 (54) I wish specially to *insist on the fact that mending and ending are opposite things*. (Chesterton 1912)
 (55) "Well, Tom, you ain't going to punch my head, I hope, because I *insist upon being sorry when you got to earth*?" (Hughes 1857)

The connection between sense and structure became apparent while examining the data. As in the first part of the corpus, every *upon/on* + *poss ing* and *upon/on* + *acc ing* complement, and almost all *upon/on* + *ing*-clause complements occurred when *insist* was used in sense 4. Only two tokens were found in which *insist* chose the *upon* + *ing*-clause complement when it was used in sense 3. Example (55) is one of those two tokens. However, the example in question is rather a peculiar one, and there is some uncertainty as to the sense used in that sentence. *That*-clauses, zero complements and *on/upon* + NP complements, on the other hand, were common with both senses. As opposed to the results from the CLMETEV1, the use of the non-sentential *on/upon* + NP complements did not vary with different senses of *insist*: both complement types occurred frequently with both senses. In addition, it is worth noting that all *to*-infinitive, *to* + NP + *on* + *ing*-clause and *against* + NP complements occurred when *insist* was used in sense 4, whereas all *to* + NP + *that*-clause, *to* + NP + *upon* + NP, *upon* + it + *that*-clause and *upon* + it + *as* + AdjP

complements occurred when *insist* was used in sense 3. As these constructions were all extremely rare in the data, no firm conclusions can be drawn based on these individual examples, with the possible exception of the *to*-infinitive, which occurred only with sense 4 in the first part of the corpus, as well.

In addition, I believe I found one example of *insist* in the *OED* sense 2, "to continue steadfastly or persist *in* a course of action, to follow steadfastly *in* (*on*) a person's steps, etc.; to continue with urgency; to persevere". This represents 0,2 percent of all the tokens in the data. The complement type in this case was the zero complement:

- (56) But when I lay withered, though so young, by the sea-shore, his country's ancient grandeur *insisted*, and I dreamed of Harry Richmond, imagining that I had been false to my childhood. (Meredith 1870)

No examples were found of the *OED* sense 1, "to stand or rest *on* or *upon*".

7.3. Extractions

There were 30 cases of extraction in the data. Relativization was clearly the most common structure involving extractions, occurring in 22 tokens. In these sentences, the most common complement type was the *on* + NP complement with 8 tokens (57), followed closely by the other non-sentential PP complement, *upon* + NP, with 7 tokens (58). The fact that the *on* + NP complement was slightly more common than the *upon* + NP complement in complex sentences involving extraction does not support the complexity principle. However, this might be at least partly explainable by the overall decline in the use of the preposition *upon* in the complementation of *insist*.

- (57) Lastly, constitutional royalty has the function which I *insisted on* at length in my last essay... (Bagehot 1867)

- (58) That is a necessity upon which one cannot *insist* too much. (Wells 1902-3)

In 5 out of the 22 cases involving relativization, *insist* had the *on* + *ing*-clause complement (59). In addition, there were two cases where the complement of *insist* was *on* + *poss ing* (60). There were no examples of *ing*-clause or *poss ing* complements with the preposition *upon*, which again shows how the use of the preposition is clearly diminishing in the complementation of *insist*.

- (59) A knock, however, came at the door, and Mrs Caffyn entered with the cup of coffee which she always *insisted on bringing* before Madge rose. (Rutherford 1896)
 (60) But no, he was precise; her report of him strikes the ear as credible, in spite of the marvel it *insists on our swallowing*. (Meredith 1895)

There were also two other types of structures involving extractions in the data. These were *wh*-movement (5 tokens) and topicalization (3 tokens). In three out of the five tokens, *wh*-movement occurred when *insist* had a non-sentential PP complement. The *on* + NP complement (61) occurred in two of the tokens and was slightly more common than the more explicit *upon* + NP (62), which occurred only once. This, again, goes against the complexity principle. In the other two tokens, *insist* had a *that*-clause complement, which was introduced by Ø in one of the tokens (63).

- (61) This was the result of what I *insist on* tediously... (Bagehot 1867)
 (62) ... consists as much in knowing what to omit as what to *insist upon*. (Butler 1912)
 (63) I took for earnest what you *insist was jest*, and now this that I pray to be jest you say is awful, wretched earnest. (Hardy 1874)

Topicalization was found in three tokens. The complements of *insist* in these cases were *on* + NP (64), *upon* + NP (65) and *upon* + *ing*-clause (66), all of which occurred only once.

- (64) This Tom had *insisted on*, for he was in great delight on the occasion, the reason of which delight must be expounded. (Hughes 1857)
 (65) Upon these two incongruous qualities Spinrobin always *insists*. (Blackwood 1910)
 (66) The scarab, which is a very small one, Leo had *insisted upon having set in a massive gold ring*... (Haggard 1887).

In the data from CLMETEV3, extractions occurred six times with gerundial complements, which represents 20 percent of all the extractions in the data. This is considerably more than in

CLMETEV1, where the corresponding percentage was only 5 percent. Thus, in the third part of the corpus, gerunds were clearly not as resistant to extractions as they were in the first part, which is an interesting development in the complementation of *insist*. As in CLMETEV1, no extractions occurred when *insist* had a *to*-infinitive complement.

8. The BNC

Having analyzed the historical data from the CLMETEV, I will now turn my attention to the present-day data from the BNC. In order to make the results from the BNC comparable with the ones from the CLMETEV, I decided to limit the search for the verb to the Imaginative Prose section of the BNC, which consists of literary texts and therefore resembles the CLMETEV the most. The Imaginative Prose section of the BNC contains 16,496,408 words from 476 texts.

8.1 The complementation patterns found in the data

The BNC is a tagged corpus, and I was therefore able to capture all the different forms of the verb *insist* (*insist*, *insists*, *insisted*, *insisting*) by using one search string, {insist}_V*. The search returned a total of 1400 tokens. From this, I took a random sample of 25 percent, which left me with 350 tokens. However, two of the tokens could not be analyzed because the sentences ended abruptly right after *insist*, leaving out its possible complements (1-2). Therefore, the number of relevant tokens from the BNC is 348.

- (1) 'Ma'am,' he said, 'I must *insist* – ' (HGV 5006)
- (2) 'But if my lady *insists* – ' (JY9 3308)

Table 4 shows the different complementation patterns of *insist* found in the data from the BNC, as well as their raw and normalized frequencies and percentages.

Complement	Raw frequency	Normalized frequency per million words	Percentage
zero complement	120	29.1	34,5%
<i>that</i> -clause	89	21.6	25,6%
<i>on</i> + <i>ing</i> -clause	87	21.1	25,0%
<i>on</i> + NP	28	6.8	8,0%
<i>upon</i> + NP	7	1.7	2,0%
<i>on</i> + <i>acc ing</i>	5	1.2	1,4%
<i>on</i> + <i>poss ing</i>	4	1.0	1,1%
<i>upon</i> + <i>ing</i> -clause	3	0.7	0,9%
<i>to</i> + NP	2	0.5	0,6%
NP	1	0.2	0,3%
<i>upon</i> + <i>poss ing</i> OR <i>acc ing</i>	1	0.2	0,3%
<i>against</i> + NP	1	0.2	0,3%
Total	348	84.3	100%

Table 4: The Imaginative Prose section of the BNC: raw and normalized frequencies and percentages of the different complements of *insist*

8.1.1 Non-sentential complements

As can be seen from the above table, there have been some significant changes in the complementation of *insist* when compared to the results obtained from the CLMETEV. By far the most common non-sentential complement in the BNC data was the zero complement (3). It occurred 120 times in the data, and had a normalized frequency of 29.1. The NF of the zero complement has increased significantly in the course of time, from 1.3 in CLMETEV1 to 10.2 in CLMETEV3 and 29.1 in the Imaginative Prose section of the BNC. This finding supports my speculations in section 7.1.1 about how the increased usage of the zero complement must be an important development in the complementation of *insist*. It is, however, important to note that the notable increase is, at least in part, explainable by the fact that the data from the BNC include considerably more quotes than the data from the CLMETEV. In fact, *insist* occurred after a quote in 78 tokens (NF 18.9), which is considerably more than in CLMETEV1 (NF 0.3) and CLMETEV3 (NF 6.7) (4).

- (3) On his mother's birthday they didn't go to the Spinning Wheel but to the Queen Victoria for lunch, because his father *insisted*. (H7A 1426)
 (4) 'You should talk to him about Eileen,' she *insisted*. (CDY 2746)

There were no examples of zero complements involving *as*-clauses in the BNC data.

The *on* + NP complement was also relatively common in the data with 28 tokens (5). Its popularity seems to have decreased significantly, however, considering that in CLMETEV3 it was the second most common complement with a normalized frequency of 13.8, whereas in the BNC data its NF was only 6.8. The *upon* + NP complement, on the other hand, occurred 7 times in the data, and had a normalized frequency of 1.7, when in CLMETEV1 its NF was 15.8 and in CLMETEV3 8.3 (6). It seems quite clear, therefore, that the popularity of both non-sentential PP complements, *on/upon* + NP, has decreased notably over the years.

- (5) Joe had *insisted on this arrangement* despite Mr Beecham's opinion that it wasn't quite seemly. (CFY 1281)
 (6) 'Well,' he continued, 'you'll have one more, but perhaps a little later and I will *insist upon it*.' (ASN 1467)

There was one case of the *upon* + NP complement in the data that was particularly interesting. In the token in question, there was no noun in the NP following the preposition *upon*. However, the context of the sentence revealed that the speaker actually insists upon two *tickets*, but the noun *tickets* has been omitted from the sentence (7). I therefore decided to regard this token as a special type of *upon* + NP complement, even though it does not actually include a noun.

- (7) I *insist upon two*. (CMP 161)

Both [+abstract] and [-abstract] nouns were common in the NPs. The abstract nouns that occurred as heads in the NPs included *secrecy*, *discipline*, *information* and *presence* (8), whereas *cab*, *flowers*, *blindfold* and *shoes* are examples of the concrete nouns that occurred in the NPs (9). Pronouns were again common, especially *it*, which was found in 7 tokens (10). In addition, there was one token in which the noun in the NP complement was [+human] (11).

- (8) I have little doubt as to why you *insist on his presence*. (HGK 1089)
- (9) None of the other children had to wear shoes, and to Martha's contrary seven-year-old mind the reasons Nana advanced for *insisting on shoes* were not satisfactory. (APU 834)
- (10) 'There's a girl to see you, Miss Emily, *insist on it* she does, quite cheeky she is, mind.' (CKD 491)
- (11) Though I do have a friend – Bunny – who always *insists on a female doctor or nurse* if he has anything wrong of a private nature. (HWL 107)

The *to* + NP complement also occurred in the data with 2 tokens and a normalized frequency of 0.5 (12). Because the NP in the *to* phrase indicates the recipient of an act of communication, the noun in the NP was [+human]. It is also noteworthy that, when discussing the optional *to* + NP complement, both Biber et al. and Huddleston and Pullum talked specifically of the pattern *to* + NP + *that*-clause. In the data from the BNC, however, no *that*-clause was required after *to* + NP in either of the two tokens because in both cases the quotations that came before *insist* and its complements already showed what it was that somebody insisted. In the data from the CLMETEV3, however, the *to* + NP complement was always followed by either a clause or an *upon* + NP complement because there were no quotations before *insist* and its complements in any of the three cases.

- (12) 'It's logical,' he *insisted to Owen* when they met. (HTX 1472)

Two other non-sentential patterns of complementation were found in the data. They were NP (13) and *against* + NP (14), both of which occurred only once in the data (NF 0.2). These patterns were both labelled obsolete in the *OED*, but the data show that they have still been used in the 20th century, even though extremely rarely.

- (13) I don't want you, she'd said, and he had *insisted the same*. (JY7 5066)
- (14) Lachlan, racing out to set up an ambush for his nephew, *insisted against his shipmaster's warning...* (APW 1123)

8.1.2 Sentential complements

The most frequent sentential pattern of complementation in the data was the *that*-clause complement with 89 tokens (NF 21.6) (15). In 33 of those cases the *that*-clause complement was introduced by Ø (16). *That*-clauses have clearly become significantly more popular in the complementation of *insist* over the years, considering that their NF was only 10.1 in the CLMETEV3.

(15) Robbie *insisted* that they walk back. (HHA 2391)

(16) Only God knows how he knew but Agrippa *insisted* we arm ourselves. (HU0 3049)

The *on* + *ing*-clause complement was the second most common sentential complement in the data with 87 tokens (NF 21.1) (17). The *upon* + *ing*-clause complement, on the other hand, only occurred 3 times in the data (NF 0.7) (18). It is interesting to see how the normalized frequency of the *on* + *ing*-clause complement has clearly increased when compared to the CLMETEV data (4.6 in CLMETEV1 and 14.4 in CLMETEV3), whereas the development of the *upon* + *ing*-clause complement has gone in the opposite direction (10.9 in CLMETEV1 and 3.7 in CLMETEV3). This provides further proof of the general development in favor of the preposition *on*, which was already mentioned in section 7.1.2. It is safe to say now that even though *upon* used to be more common than *on* in the complementation of *insist*, as can be seen in Table 2, *on* has clearly become the preferred preposition in present-day English. This development does not concern only the *on/upon* + *ing*-clause complements, but also other types of complements where there is a choice between the two prepositions, i.e. *on/upon* + NP, *on/upon* + *poss ing* and *on/upon* + *acc ing* complements.

(17) In the afternoon he starts by sleeping, then takes over the kitchen and *insists* on preparing extravagant five-course meals. (A08 1193)

(18) Alan *insisted* upon managing the oars, which made it even worse. (AS7 527)

There has been a surprising development in the use of *that*-clause and *ing*-clause complements. When the first and third parts of the CLMETEV were analyzed, there seemed to be clear signs of the Great Complement Shift in action, considering the increased use of *ing*-clause complements at the expense of *that*-clause complements. In the data from the BNC, however, the NF of *that*-clauses has increased quite dramatically (from 10.1 to 21.6), making *that*-clauses again more common than *on* + *ing*-clauses. This is an interesting development, which stands out in clear contrast to the general changes in sentential complementation that have taken place during the past few centuries, caused by the Great Complement Shift.

In the BNC data, there were five clear violations of the *horror aequi* principle, and they all occurred when the verb form *insisting* had an *on* + *ing*-clause complement (19-20). The NF of these violations is 0.3, which is the same as in the first part of the CLMETEV, and less than in the third part of the CLMETEV (1.1). Seeing that *horror aequi* violations were found in the data from both parts of the CLMETEV as well as in the BNC data, it can be said that *horror aequi* violations with *insist* have been, and still are, quite rare, but they do exist.

(19) John-William *insisting on having everything just so*,... (H7P 1119)

(20) You flatter me by *insisting on seeing me as some sort of Casanove figure*. (JXV 1990)

The *on* + *acc ing* complement occurred 5 times in the data, and had a normalized frequency of 1.2 (21). What was interesting was that even though *poss ing* complements were always much more frequent than *acc ing* complements in the CLMETEV data, in the BNC data the *on* + *acc ing* complement was actually slightly more common than the *on* + *poss ing* complement, which occurred 4 times in the data (NF 1.0) (22). In addition, there were no clear cases of the *upon* + *poss ing* or *upon* + *acc ing* complements, and only one example of an *upon* + *poss ing* OR *acc ing* complement in the data (23). The results not only show how significantly the use of the preposition *upon* has decreased over time, but also how the overall frequency of *poss ing* complements has also declined. The *on* + *acc ing* complements, on the other hand, have become slightly more popular, and their

normalized frequency has gone up from 0.3 in CLMETEV1 to 1.1 in CLMETEV3 and 1.2 in the Imaginative Prose section of the BNC.

- (21) 'Apparently not, otherwise Niall would have *insisted* on him being admitted.' (JXW 3050)
- (22) 'Why do you think I *insisted* on your staying on here in Denmark...' (HA5 2491)
- (23) He sighed deeply: he had *insisted* upon her accompanying him that day... (EWH 597)

As was already pointed out in 5.1, discontinuous constructions form a complexity factor, and may therefore have an effect on the complement selection of *insist*. Insertions, for example, cause such discontinuous constructions. Only 6 insertions were found in the data from the BNC. In 4 of those cases, insertion occurred in sentences with a *that*-clause complement (24). In addition, one case of insertion was found in a sentence where *insist* had the *on* + *acc ing* complement (25) and another one in a sentence where it had the *on* + *poss ing* complement (26).

- (24) My mother had *insisted* when my father left that she should keep the house... (G06 802)
- (25) Bordeaux had not taken kindly to competition from what it dismissed as 'the hinterland', and had even *insisted* at one point on Bergerac wines being shipped in smaller casks... (HH8 358)
- (26) If I could not reassure her by telling her Neil was there, and watching, it was possible, more, probable, that she would *insist* either on my moving into a lodging in the village.. (CKF 2321)

In the BNC data, insertion occurred clearly more often in sentences with the explicit *that*-clause complement, than in sentences with *poss ing* and *acc ing* complements. This supports the complexity principle, which states that the more explicit grammatical option will tend to be favored in cognitively more complex environments. I also examined whether the length of an insertion had an effect on the selection of a complement type. In the data, when the insertions consisted of more than three words, the complement was always a *that*-clause, which is the most explicit sentential complement type (27). When the other complement types were used, the insertions consisted of three words or less (25-26). Therefore, based on the results from the BNC, it can be said that the length of insertions does indeed seem to have an effect on the selection of complementation

patterns, as the longer and more complex insertions tend to occur with the explicit *that*-clause complement. This also supports the complexity principle. When compared to the results obtained from the CLMETEV, however, it becomes clear that the situation is not quite as straightforward as the results from the BNC would suggest (see 6.1.2 and 7.1.2).

- (27) L♦onie *insisted*, watching the blade fall quickly through the bread, that she did not know the person's name. (GUK 1714)

Interestingly, no passives were found in the data. This is surprising, because several passives were found in both parts of the CLMETEV. The lack of passives might be explainable by the fact that quotes are so frequent in the BNC, and *insist* is always in the active voice after a quote because, with quotes, there is always clearly someone who does the insisting. Another reason might be that using passives with *insist* has simply become rarer over the years.

8.2 Sense and structure

The sense that occurred most frequently in the data was again the *OED* sense 4, "to make a demand with persistent urgency; to take a persistent or peremptory stand in regard to a stipulation, claim, demand, proposal, etc." There were 221 examples of *insist* in this sense, which represents 64 percent of the tokens. This is somewhat less than in CLMETEV1 (71,7 percent) and in CLMETEV3 (65,9 percent), which would suggest that the use of *insist* in the *OED* sense 4 has indeed decreased in the course of time, which was already pointed out in 7.2.

- (28) 'I *insist* that you take me to a fastline terminal.' (F9X 4453)
 (29) Within ten minutes of take-off, Myeloski had *insisted* on being fed. (CML 2652)
 (30) When I *insisted* on more information Wendy gave me the address of a flat in Copenhagen where they'd stayed... (HA5 61)
 (31) "Bed!" she *insisted*, "I don't want you falling ill and missing and missing classes." (EVG 697)
 (32) He had telephoned Uncle Vernon before midnight to explain that Rose Lipman had *insisted* on Stella being present at a small celebration given by the Board of Governors. (FNU 1869)

The *OED* sense 3, "to dwell at length or with emphasis *on* or *upon* a matter; hence, to insist on = to assert or maintain persistently" was also common in the data with 127 tokens, which is approximately 36 percent of the total number of tokens. The corresponding percentages were 27,9 in CLMETEV1 and 33,9 in CLMETEV3, which provides further proof of the increased use of sense 3, at the expense of sense 4.

- (33) 'Why do they *insist* all babies take the same time?' (HGJ 71)
- (34) I *insisted* that toads, in particular, were malicious. (A0R 2928)
- (35) 'It's as true as I'm sitting here telling you,' *insisted* Dodger Gillespie, never one to be subject to fancies or unsought hallucinations. (CJA 1743)
- (36) Anna was quite a flirt in those days, Mr. James *insists* on that, it is quite the hardest part to imagine. (F9R 221)
- (37) 'I would really have tried,' she *insisted* to someone he could not see. (FPF 1700)

There was, again, a clear connection between sense and structure. Every *on/upon* + *ing*-clause, *on/upon* + *acc ing* and *on/upon* + *poss ing* complement (38), as well as almost all of the non-sentential *on/upon* + NP complements (39) occurred when *insist* was used in sense 4. There was only one example of both an *on* + NP and an *upon* + NP complement when *insist* was used in sense 3 (40).

- (38) While you're in the bathroom I *insist* on making that drink. (JYC 2556)
- (39) 'Don't forget, you can *insist* on a blindfold.' (K8T 715)
- (40) But if I tell her the truth and *insist* upon it, I shall be disobeying my husband and causing his mother unnecessary worry... (EWH 1079)

The great majority of the tokens that included *insist* in sense 3 had the zero complement (89 tokens) (41), but it was also a relatively common complement type when *insist* was used in sense 4 (30 tokens) (42). In addition, *that*-clauses were common with both senses, as they were found 33 times with sense 3 (43) and 56 times with sense 4 (44). It is also noteworthy that all *to* + NP and NP complements occurred when *insist* was used in sense 3, whereas the *against* + NP complement occurred when *insist* was used in sense 4.

- (41) 'Nothing would have happened,' Robbie *insisted*. (HHA 1942)
- (42) 'Well, if you *insist* – your good health, sir! ' (G10 497)
- (43) 'Oh, Mother denied it, of course, *insisted* he wasn't the father.' (HGY 2320)
- (44) She had been prepared to leave the restaurant at once, but Nathan had *insisted* they finish their meal. (H7W 3885)

No examples were found of the *OED* senses 1 and 2, and it seems safe to say that at least sense 1, "to stand or rest *on* or *upon*", has indeed become obsolete quite a while ago, which is also what the *OED* claims. Sense 2, "to continue steadfastly or persist *in* a course of action, to follow steadfastly *in* (*on*) a person's steps, etc.; to continue with urgency; to persevere", on the other hand, is labelled *archaic* in the *OED*. This is also supported by my results because I only found two examples of this sense in the CLMETEV data. It cannot therefore be said with certainty that the *OED* sense 2 has already become obsolete, but it is definitely an extremely rare sense of *insist*.

8.3 Extractions

There were altogether 13 cases of extraction in the data. Just as in the data from both parts of the CLMETEV, the most common structure involving extraction was relativization with 11 tokens. Out of the 11 tokens, five included a sentential *ing*-clause complement: the *on* + *ing*-clause complement (45) occurred four times and the *upon* + *ing*-clause complement (46) occurred once. This does not support the complexity principle because the more explicit *upon* + *ing*-clause complement should be favoured in complex environments. The same is also true with the non-sentential PP complements, although not as clearly, as the *on* + NP complement (47) occurred twice and the *upon* + NP complement (48) occurred only once in sentences involving relativization.

- (45) This baby you *insist on having* keeps other babies out, ones which won't cause this distress to you and yours. (HGJ 2879)
- (46) Signor fragolli would meet us at one thirty P.M. outside the Central Naval Museum, which he *insisted upon calling the Stock Exchange*. (HR7 965)
- (47) All the talk of weddings made Anne feel downhearted and impatient with the secrecy that John *insisted on*. (G16 1664)
- (48) 'You have achieved your objective, Mr Wyatt, so can we have this talk you *insist upon* and go our separate ways?' (H8J 441)

In three out of the 11 tokens that involved relativization, *insist* had a *that*-clause introduced by \emptyset as its complement (49). In one of those cases the process involving extraction resembled relativization very closely, with *as* functioning as a relative pronoun (50).

(49) He looked with concern at the scratches on Lucy's face, then poured tea which he *insisted* she drank at once.

(50) He could not imagine how an intelligent person (as Ludo *insisted* this girl was) would behave as Constance had... (CEY 2654)

In addition, there were also two other types of structures involving extractions in the data. These were interrogation (51) and *wh*-movement (52), both of which occurred only once in the data from the BNC. The complements of *insist* in these cases were *upon* + *ing*-clause and a *that*-clause introduced by \emptyset , respectively.

(51) Which of them, she *insisted* upon knowing, with a continuing and unnecessary mockery in her eye, was the more credulous? (G1X 122)

(52) In fact, he was recruited to the discipline by what some *insisted* was the arsy-versy way. (HWA 350)

Example (52) is particularly interesting because it illustrates the “that-trace effect”. Without *wh*-movement the sentence would be “some *insisted* that it was the arsy-versy way”. After the extraction, we get a trace between the words *that* and *was*. According to Lasnik and Uriagereka, however, the word *that* cannot be immediately followed by a trace without loss of grammaticality (1988, 94). Sentence (52), for example, becomes “what some *insisted* that was the arsy-versy way” after *wh*-movement, which is clearly ungrammatical. For this reason, the word *that* has to be omitted altogether in a sentence such as (52) in order to keep the sentence grammatical.

The results from the BNC did not support the complexity principle, as the less explicit *on* was used more often than the more explicit *upon* in complex environments caused by extractions, *on* occurring six times and *upon* three times. This can, however, be explained by the general development in favor of the preposition *on* in the complementation of *insist*. In addition, *ing*-clauses

were slightly more common (6 tokens) than *that*-clauses (4 tokens) in such sentences, which also violates the complexity principle. The six extractions that occurred with gerundial complements represent 46.2 percent of all the extractions in the data. This is almost half of the extractions, and significantly more than in CLMETEV1 and CLMETEV3, where the corresponding percentages were 5 and 20 percent, respectively. This is an interesting finding, as it shows that gerunds have clearly become much less resistant to extractions over the years, at least in the complementation of *insist*.

9. Conclusion

This thesis has investigated the complementation and senses of the verb *insist* from the early 18th century to the late 20th century. As was shown by the data from the CLMETEV and the BNC, *insist* selects a wide variety of complements, both non-sentential and sentential. The most common non-sentential complement types found in the data from the two corpora were the zero complement and the *on/upon* + NP complements. There were also some other patterns, which only occurred once or twice in the data. These patterns were NP, *to* + NP, *against* + NP, *upon* + it + *as* + AdjP and *to* + NP + *upon* + NP. In addition, several different types of sentential complements were found in the data. The most common sentential complements were *that*-clauses and the gerundial *on/upon* + *ing*-clause, *on/upon* + *poss ing* and *on/upon* + *acc ing* complements, all of which occurred both in the CLMETEV data and in the BNC data. On the other hand, the sentential *to*-infinitives, *upon* + it + *to*-infinitives, *on/upon* + it + *that*-clauses, *to* + NP + *that*-clauses, *to* + NP + *on* + *ing*-clauses and *upon* + *wh*-clauses were much rarer in the complementation of *insist*, and only occurred in CLMETEV.

There have been some interesting developments in the complement selection of the verb *insist* during the past few centuries. One of the most important findings of this study was how there has been a clear development in favor of the preposition *on* in the complementation of *insist*. In fact, it is safe to say that *on* is clearly preferred to *upon* in present-day English even though *upon* used to be the more common preposition in the complementation of *insist*. This development concerns all types of complements where there is a choice between the two prepositions, i.e. *on/upon* + NP, *on/upon* + *ing*-clause, *on/upon* + *poss ing* and *on/upon* + *acc ing* complements. Other important changes in the complementation of *insist* include the notable increase in the use of zero complements and *that*-clause complements, and the decreased usage of the non-sentential *on/upon* + NP complements and the sentential *on/upon* + *poss ing* complements.

The analysis of the different senses of *insist* revealed that the *OED* senses 3 and 4 were highly common in the data from both corpora. Sense 4 was always the most frequently used sense, but it also became clear from the data that the use of *insist* in sense 3 has increased steadily over the years, at the expense of sense 4. The data also showed that there is a clear connection between sense and structure. Almost all *on/upon* + *ing*-clause, *on/upon* + *acc ing* and *on/upon* + *poss ing* complements in both the CLMETEV and the BNC occurred when *insist* was used in the *OED* sense 4. This is also supported by the *OED*, which only gives an *ing*-clause as a complement of *insist* in sense 4. Zero complements and *that*-clause complements, on the other hand, occurred frequently with both senses. The situation with *on/upon* + NP complements varied considerably in the two parts of the CLMETEV and the BNC. In the first part of the CLMETEV, the preferred complement with the *OED* sense 4 was the *upon* + NP complement, whereas the *on* + NP complement was preferred when *insist* was used in sense 3. In the third part of the corpus, however, both complement types occurred frequently with both senses. Furthermore, in the BNC, almost all *on/upon* + NP complements occurred when *insist* was used in sense 4. This clearly shows that, with *on/upon* + NP complements, the connection between sense and structure has not remained stable over the years. There were also other connections between sense and structure, but because they involved complementation patterns that were extremely rare, no firm conclusions can be based on those examples alone, with the possible exception of the *to*-infinitive, which occurred only with sense 4 in both parts of the CLMETEV. In addition to senses 3 and 4, two examples were found of the *OED* sense 2, which is labelled *archaic* in the *OED*. My findings clearly show that sense 2 is an extremely rare sense of *insist*, but because it did occur in the data, it cannot be said with absolute certainty that it has become completely obsolete. The *OED* sense 1, on the other hand, did not occur in the data from the CLMETEV or the BNC, which suggests that the sense has become obsolete quite a while ago.

Insertions occurred in the data from both corpora, but they were clearly less common in the BNC. In both corpora, insertion tended to occur in sentences with a *that*-clause complement instead of some other sentential complement. This supports the complexity principle because *that*-clause complements are more explicit than the other sentential complements. On the other hand, however, the complexity principle was clearly violated in the case of non-sentential PP complements, as the *on* + NP complement tended to be favoured in sentences that included insertions, instead of the more explicit *upon* + NP complement. However, it was also important to see whether the length of an insertion had an effect on the selection of a complement type. The situation varied considerably in the two corpora. *That*-clauses occurred with both short and long insertions, except in the BNC data, where *that*-clause complements were always used with longer insertions. This supports the complexity principle. The less explicit gerundial complements, however, occurred with relatively long insertions in CLMETEV1, but only with short insertions in CLMETEV3 and the BNC. Interestingly, *to*-infinitives, which are less explicit than *that*-clauses but more explicit than *ing*-clauses, occurred only with short insertions. In the case of *on/upon* + NP complements, the results were again different in the two parts of the CLMETEV. In the first part, the length of the insertions did not seem to influence the choice between the non-sentential PP complements at all. However, in the third part, the more explicit *upon* + NP occurred only with longer insertions, which supports the complexity principle, but the less explicit *on* + NP complement occurred with both short and long insertions, even though it should only occur in less complex environments.

Passive constructions form another complexity factor. Passives were found in both parts of the CLMETEV, but, interestingly, there were no passives in the BNC data. The reason for this is probably the abundance of quotes in the BNC, because *insist* is always in the active voice after a quote. Based on the results from the CLMETEV, it seems safe to say that the non-sentential *on/upon* + NP complements are clearly preferred when *insist* occurs in a passive sentence. The results also showed that the *on* + NP complement was much more common in passive sentences

than the more explicit *upon* + NP complement, which does not support the complexity principle.

Extractions may also influence the selection of complements. By far the most common structure involving extraction in both corpora was relativization. The preferred non-sentential complement in sentences involving relativization was clearly the *on* + NP complement, which goes against the complexity principle. On the other hand, in the case of sentential complements, *that*-clauses were more common than *ing*-clauses in sentences involving relativization in CLMETEV1, whereas in CLMETEV3 and the BNC the situation was reversed. Other types of extraction that also occurred in the data were *wh*-movement, topicalization, interrogation and pseudo-cleft movement. In the case of *wh*-movement, the only type of sentential complement that occurred was a *that*-clause, which supports the complexity principle. However, the less explicit *on* + NP complement was again more common than *upon* + NP, which violates the complexity principle. The fact that the *on* + NP complement was so common in sentences involving extractions, insertions and passives clearly shows that *on* has indeed become the favoured preposition in the complementation of *insist*, even in complex environments. Topicalizations, interrogations and pseudo-cleft movements were so rare in the data that no firm conclusions can be based on those examples alone.

The Great Complement Shift is another factor that affects complementation, involving the rise of gerundial complements at the expense of infinitives and *that*-clauses. The results obtained from the CLMETEV and the BNC concerning the effect of the Great Complement Shift on the verb *insist* were quite interesting. When the first and third parts of the CLMETEV were analyzed, there were clear signs of the Great Complement Shift in action, as *ing*-clause complements had clearly increased at the expense of *that*-clause complements. In the data from the BNC, however, *that*-clauses had increased quite dramatically, making them again more common than *ing*-clauses. This is an interesting development, which goes against the general changes in sentential complementation that have taken place during the past few centuries, caused by the Great Complement Shift.

Horror aequi is yet another factor that should be taken into consideration when investigating complementation. There were altogether 13 clear violations against the *horror aequi* principle in the data, and they all occurred when the verb form *insisting* had an *on* + *ing*-clause complement. In addition, there were 6 other cases, in which the *horror aequi* principle was not as clearly violated. This is because in those cases, more than one word had been inserted between the *ing*-forms, placing them further away from each other. In those 6 cases, *insist* had several different kinds of gerundial complements. As some *horror aequi* violations were found in the data from both corpora, it can be said that while *horror aequi* violations with *insist* are quite rare, they do exist.

Although this thesis has provided an overview on the complementation of the verb *insist*, there is still room for further research on the subject. First, it would be useful to analyze data from other corpora to see if the results obtained are similar to the ones reported in this thesis. Second, it would be possible to study the effects of different registers on the complementation of *insist* by utilizing the different text types found in the BNC. For example, because this thesis has focused solely on written English, it would be interesting to analyze the complementation of *insist* in spoken English. Third, regional variation in the complementation of *insist* would also be an intriguing research topic. Fourth, analyzing data from the periods 1780-1850 and 1920-1960, which were not included in this thesis, could also provide some new insight into the complementation of *insist*.

References

Primary sources:

The British National Corpus (BNC)

The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, extended version (CLMETEV)

Secondary sources:

Ball, C.N. 1994. "Automated Text Analysis: Cautionary Tales." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 9: 295-302.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad & Randi Reppen. 1998. *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burnard, Lou (ed.). 2007. *Reference Guide for the British National Corpus (XLM Edition)*. Available from <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/docs/URG/>. [Accessed in February 2014]

De Smet, Hendrik. 2005. "A Corpus of Late Modern English Texts." *ICAME Journal* 29, 69-82.

Good, Melissa, Elizabeth Walter and Kate Woodford, eds. 2008. *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gries, Stefan Th. 2010g. "Methodological Skills in Corpus Linguistics: A Polemic and Some Pointers Towards Quantitative Methods." In *Corpus linguistics in language teaching*, eds. Tony Harris and Maria Moreno Jaén, 121-146. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang. Available from: <http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/stgries/research/overview-research.html>. [Accessed 19 March 2014]

Herbst, Thomas, David Heath, Ian F. Roe and Dieter Götz. 2004. *A Valency Dictionary of English*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Huang, James. 1997. *Introduction to Syntax*. Linguistic Institute.

Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kennedy, Graeme. 1998. *An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.

- Lasnik, Howard and Juan Uriagereka. 1988. *A Course in GB Syntax: Lectures on Binding and Empty Categories*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1968. "Some Assumptions in the Metatheory of Linguistics." *Linguistics* 39, 87-102.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Jan Svartvik. 2002. *A Communicative Grammar of English*. 3rd edition. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Lindquist, Hans. 2009. *Corpus Linguistics and the Description of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lüdeling, Anke, Stefan Evert and Marco Baroni. 2007. "Using web data for linguistic purposes." In *Language and Computers – Studies in Practical Linguistics, Volume 59: Corpus Linguistics and the Web*, eds. Marianne Hundt, Nadja Nesselhauf and Carolin Biewer, 7-24. Amsterdam, Editions Rodopi.
- McEnery, Tony and Andrew Wilson. 2001. *Corpus Linguistics*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, online edition. Available from: [http:// www.oxfordadvancedlearnersdictionary.com/](http://www.oxfordadvancedlearnersdictionary.com/) [Accessed 4 November 2010]
- Perlmutter, David and Scott Soames. 1979. *Syntactic Argumentation and the Structure of English*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Poutsma, H. 1904. *A Grammar of Late Modern English*. Part 1. *The Sentence, Section 1: The Elements of the Sentence*. Groningen: P. Noordhoff.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman.
- Rohdenburg, Günter. 1996. "Cognitive Complexity and Increased Grammatical Explicitness in English." *Cognitive Linguistics* 7, 149-182.
- Rohdenburg, Günter. 2003. "Cognitive complexity and horror aequi as factors determining the use of interrogative clause linkers in English." In *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English*, eds. Günter Rohdenburg and Britta Mondorf, 205-249. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rohdenburg, Günter. 2006. "The Role of Functional Constraints in the Evolution of the English Complementation System." In *Syntax, Style and Grammatical Norms*, eds. Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Dieter Kastovsky, Nikolaus Ritt and Herbert Schendl, 143-166. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Somers, Harold. 1984. "On the Validity of the Complement-Adjunct Distinction in Valency Grammar." *Linguistics* 22, 507-530.

The Oxford English Dictionary, online edition. Available from: <http://www.oed.com/>. [Accessed September 2010]

- Vosberg, Uwe. 2003. "Cognitive Complexity and the Establishment of *-ing* Constructions with Retrospective Verbs in Modern English". In *Insights into Late Modern English*, eds. Marina Dossena and Charles Jones, 197-220. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Vosberg, Uwe. 2009. "Non-finite complements". In *One Language, Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English*, eds. Günter Rohdenburg and Julia Schlüter, 212-227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.